

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



FROM THE LIBRARY OF THE
REVEREND WILLIAM PARK ARMSTRONG, D.D.



BR 515 .R9 1844 c.1
Rupp, I. Daniel 1803-1878,
He pasa ekklesia

Copy 1



AN ORIGINAL HISTORY
OF THE
RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS
AT PRESENT EXISTING IN
THE UNITED STATES.

HE PASA EKKLESIA.

AN ORIGINAL HISTORY

OF THE

RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS

AT PRESENT EXISTING IN

THE UNITED STATES.

CONTAINING AUTHENTIC ACCOUNTS OF THEIR

RISE, PROGRESS, STATISTICS AND DOCTRINES.

WRITTEN EXPRESSLY FOR THE WORK BY EMINENT

THEOLOGICAL PROFESSORS, MINISTERS, AND LAY-MEMBERS,

OF THE RESPECTIVE DENOMINATIONS.

PROJECTED, COMPILED AND ARRANGED BY

I. DANIEL RUPP,

OF LANCASTER, PA.

AUTHOR OF "DER MAERTYRER GESCHICHTE," ETC. ETC.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY J. Y. HUMPHREYS.

HARRISBURG: CLYDE AND WILLIAMS.

1844.

Entered, according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1844, by
JAMES Y. HUMPHREYS, AND CLYDE AND WILLIAMS,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

C. Sherman, Printer,
19 St. James Street.

P R E F A C E .

THE projector and compiler of this work, while examining many years since "Histories of Religions," and hearing numerous complaints by ministers and lay members of different denominations, that such books had unjustly represented their religion, was forcibly impressed, that a work like the one now offered to the public, was desirable and much needed : he then conceived the plan of obtaining the history of each denomination from the pen of some one of its most distinguished ministers or professors ; thus affording each sect the opportunity of giving its own history—considering that a work thus prepared must be entirely free from the faults of misrepresentation, so generally brought against books of this character.

To supply this desideratum, and to furnish a comprehensive history of the religious denominations in the United States, and also to present to the public a book, as free as possible from all grounds of complaint, the projector, two years ago, made application to many of the most prominent divines and lay members of different denominations, for their views of such a work, receiving in all cases their approbation, and many at once consenting to aid, by writing or procuring the necessary articles.

It would be superfluous to say any thing in regard to the contributors to this work—they are too favourably known to their own sects to need it, and their names accompanying each article, is sufficient guarantee that justice has been done to all, so far as the projector was enabled to attain it.

It is presumed, that no writer in this work can have had any motive to wilfully misrepresent the doctrine of the denomination of which he is a member ; it is admitted, that he may have been influ-

enced by a bias, natural to many, to present the "Beauties of his own Faith" in glowing colours; and where this may appear to have been attempted, it is left to the reader to make all due allowance.

In the history, and especially in the creed of the different denominations, the unprejudiced reader has a subject for candid investigation, and will be able to draw his own conclusions from authentic data. Though *truth* and *error* may be commingled, still the lover of free inquiry will have nothing to fear. It must be admitted, that many opinions are presented which cannot be maintained by "Thus saith the Lord;" but as the projector has done his part in giving each sect an opportunity of telling its own story, and in its own way he thus leaves it to a liberal and discerning public.

Lancaster, Pa., April, 1844.

CONTENTS.

Associate Presbyterian Church in North America. By THE REV. W. I. CLELAND AND THE REV. JAMES P. MILLER.	9
Associate Reformed Church. By THE REV. JOHN FORSYTH, D. D.	21
Baptists. By THE REV. A. D. GILLETTE, A. M.	42
Freewill Baptists. By THE REV. PORTER S. BURBANK, A. M.	58
Seventh Day Baptists. By THE REV. W. B. GILLET.	70
Baptists or Brethren, German. By THE REV. PHILIP BOYLE.	92
Baptists, Seventh Day, German. By WILLIAM M. FAHNESTOCK, M. D.	98
Catholic, Roman. By PROFESSOR W. JOS. WALTER.	112
Christians, or Christian Connexion. By THE REV. DAVID MILLARD.	166
Church of God. By THE REV. JOHN WINEBRENNER, V. D. M.	171
Congregationalists. By THE REV. E. W. ANDREWS.	184
Cumberland Presbyterians. By THE REV. RICHARD BEARD, D. D.	212
Dutch Reformed. By THE REV. W. C. BROWNLEE, D. D.	220
Disciples of Christ. By THE REV. R. RICHARDSON.	250
Protestant Episcopal Church. By THE REV. R. C. SHIMEALL.	270
Evangelical Association. By THE REV. W. W. ORWIG.	300
Friends or Quakers. By THOMAS EVANS.	306
Friends. By WILLIAM GIBBONS, M. D.	323
German Reformed Church. By THE REV. LEWIS MAYER, D. D.	337
The Jews and their Religion. By THE REV. ISAAC LEESER.	350
Evangelical Lutheran Church. By THE REV. S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D.	370
Latter Day Saints. By JOSEPH SMITH.	404
Moravians, or more properly, Unitas Fratrum, or United Brethren's Church. By L. D. VON SCHWEINITZ.	411
The Methodist Society. By THE REV. W. M. STILWELL.	423
Methodist Episcopal Church. By THE REV. NATHAN BANGS, D. D.	425
Methodist Protestant Church. By THE REV. JAMES R. WILLIAMS.	461
Reformed Methodist Church. By THE REV. WESLEY BAILEY.	466
True Wesleyan Methodist Church. By THE REV. J. TIMBERMAN.	478
The Mennonites. By CHRISTIAN HERR.	486
Reformed Mennonite Society. By THE REV. JOHN HERR.	502

Presbyteries. The following summary of the statistical table will present some idea of the present condition of this society. The names of the Presbyteries generally indicate their locality.

Presbyteries.	States.	No. Minis.	No. Cong.	No. Commu.
Cambridge, - - - -	New York,	4	10	924*
Albany, - - - -	New York,	5	7	556*
Philadelphia, - - -	Pennsylvania,	7	18	1165*
Stamford, - - - -	Upper Canada,	3	6	521
Shenango, - - - -	Pennsylvania,	8	19	2259
Allegheny, - - - -	Pennsylvania,	10	23	963*
Chartiers, - - - -	Pennsylvania,	12	20	2122*
Ohio, - - - -	Ohio,	7	17	1281*
Richland, - - - -	Ohio,	5	16	735*
Muskingum, - - - -	Ohio,	8	22	1519*
Miami, - - - -	Ohio,	6	23	738*
Indiana, - - - -	Indiana,	3	14	367*
Illinois, - - - -	Illinois,	7	16	327*
One Foreign Mission,	Trinidad, W. I.	2		
Ministers, itinerating,		18		
		105	211	13,477

The Synod, which is composed of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation, meets annually on its own adjournment. Each Presbytery meets on its own adjournment, and as often as circumstances require.

The Theological Seminary is located at Cannonsburg, Pa. It has two professorships—one of didactic theology and Hebrew, at present filled by James Martin, D. D.; the other of church history, pastoral theology and biblical literature, at present filled by Thomas Beveridge, D. D. At this institution there is but one term each year, which continues from the first Monday of November until the last of March. The students are required to attend four terms to complete their course of study. The professors give lectures on their respective subjects. The text-book which is used in didactic theology is "JOHANNIS MARKII CHRISTIANÆ THEOLOGIÆ MEDULLA."

DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE.

The Associate Presbyterian Church of North America, is a branch of the Church of Scotland; and holds the doctrines of the Reforma-

* Those marked thus * are incomplete, there being no returns from several congregations, and some of these the largest in the Presbytery: 15,000 is the estimated number of communicants.

Several Presbyteries, though marked as located in a particular state, include also the care of congregations in neighbouring states, e. g. the Presbytery of Cambridge, New York, includes the congregations in Vermont and Canada East.

tion as set forth in the standards of the Westminster Assembly. Hence the Westminster Confession of Faith is her Confession of Faith; the Larger and Shorter Catechisms are her authorized systems of catechetical instruction. The Form of Presbyterial Church Government, and the Directory for public worship and for family worship, are received and acknowledged as of obligatory authority in this church. The xxiii. chapter of the Confession of Faith, respecting the concern of the civil magistrate with the church, is received with some explanations, which are given in the Declaration and Testimony which this church has adopted and published. These explanations deny to the civil magistrate any authority in or control over the church, as respects either doctrine or discipline, by virtue of his office. The church is regarded as a free and independent society, to be governed and regulated according to the rules laid down in the Word of God, and responsible for the faithful discharge of her duty to Christ her only king and head.

The doctrine of the Confession of Faith concerning public, social, religious vowing or covenanting, as set forth in the xxii. chapter of the Confession of Faith, and as formerly practised by the churches of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Reformed Church of Holland, is both held and practised by this church,—with this difference, that the civil part of the National Covenant of Scotland, and the Solemn League and Covenant of the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, or any mingling of civil with religious affairs, have not been regarded by this church as belonging to the religious and ecclesiastical part of this duty.

This church, both in doctrine and practice, has always adhered to the use of a literal poetic version of the inspired Book of Psalms in the praises of God, as that only appointed of God, and consequently the only proper one.

As other bodies of professing Christians, both in Great Britain and this country, profess adherence to the standards and doctrines of the Westminster Assembly, the Associate Church also, from an early period of her existence in this country, has published a "Declaration and Testimony," more particularly setting forth, explaining, and defending some of the doctrines of the Westminster standards, and stating the prevailing errors against which this church considers herself called upon to testify. To this Declaration and Testimony she has prefixed a narrative, briefly setting forth some of the leading facts in her history, and the reasons of her maintaining a separate communion from other existing denominations of the present day. These books, which constitute the publicly authorized *subordinate* standards,

together with her Book of Discipline, set forth all the distinctive principles and doctrines of this church. These books she calls her subordinate standards, because held in subordination to the Bible,—the supreme standard of the church of Christ.

The following formula of questions, proposed to private members on their admission to fellowship in the church, will give a brief but pretty distinct view of the principles and religious practices of this church :

1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice ?

2. Do you profess your adherence to the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Form of Presbyterial Church Government, and Directory for the worship of God, as these are received and witnessed for by us, in our Declaration and Testimony, for the doctrine and order of the church of Christ ?

3. Do you profess your resolution through grace to continue in the faith, according to the profession you now make of it, and to be subject to the order and discipline of the house of God ; to be diligent in your attendance on public ordinances, teaching and sealing, according to your profession, on secret prayer, on family worship, as you may have opportunity, (to be used if the applicant be a head of a family,) in keeping up family worship daily, morning and evening, and to perform all other duties incumbent on you, according to this profession, in whatever station you may occupy in life ; and that you will make conscience of promoting the knowledge of Christ, and his truths, as by other means, so more especially by a holy and spiritual conversation, consistent with your profession ?

HISTORY.

The Associate Presbyterian Church in North America, is a branch of the Church of Scotland. The brief space to which this sketch is necessarily limited, forbids us to refer particularly to that eventful period in the history of the Church of Scotland, that intervenes between the years 1638 and 1688. Yet the causes which ultimately led to the Secession of 1733, may be distinctly found in the history of that period. During that reforming period the church complained of the law of patronage as an evil, and had obtained various acts against it, particularly an Act of Parliament passed at Edinburgh, March 9th, 1649, Charles I. and II. Parl. 2 Sess. Act 39, the patronage of kirks was abolished. That act had such an immediate connexion with the origin of the Associate Church, that we may transcribe at least a part of it, as follows—“Considering that patronage and presentation of

kirks is an evil and bondage, under which the Lord's people and the ministers of this land have long groaned; and that it hath no warrant in God's word, but is founded only on the common law, and is a custom popish, and brought into the kirk in time of ignorance and superstition; and that the same is contrary to the *Second Book of Discipline*, in which, upon solid and good ground, it is reckoned among the abuses that are desired to be reformed, and [contrary] unto several acts of General Assemblies; and that it is *prejudicial to the liberty of the people* and planting of kirks, and *unto the free calling* and entry of ministers unto their charge: and the said estates being willing and desirous to promote and advance the reformation foresaid, that every thing in the house of God may be ordered according to his word and commandment, do therefore, from a sense of the former obligations, and upon the former grounds and reasons, discharge for ever hereafter, all patronages and presentation of kirks, whether belonging to the king or any laic patron, presbyteries, or others within this kingdom, as being unlawful and unwarrantable by God's word, and contrary to the doctrine and liberties of this Kirk; and do therefore rescind, make void, and annul all gifts and rights granted thereanent, and all former acts made in Parliament, or in any inferior judicatory, in favour of any patron or patrons whatsoever, so far as the same doth or may relate unto the presentation of kirks;" making it a penal offence, under any pretext, to give or receive such presentation. And Presbyteries were prohibited from admitting to trials for ordination any candidate upon any such presentation.

It may here be remarked, that this act was in full accordance with the doctrine of the Church of Scotland, from her first organization under the doctrines and principles of the Reformation from Popery. In the first Book of Discipline, drawn up by John Knox, we find the following rule: "No minister should be intruded on any particular kirk, without their consent." The same principle is asserted in the Second Book of Discipline, adopted in 1578, and in force until 1640. This principle is also repeatedly recognised in the Directory of the Westminster divines.

The above Act of Parliament continued in force in the Church of Scotland until the year 1712, or the 11th of Queen Anne, when the doctrine of patronage was again revived by Act of Parliament, in the Church of Scotland, to the great grief of at least most good men in her. Many of these not only opposed the reviving of patronage to the last, in the General Assembly, but entered their solemn protest against it in the Assembly. The exercise of the right of patronage, at this time restored to the patrons, was for some time used with

mildness, and the wishes of the congregations were generally consulted by the patrons. But men greedy of power and gain, were not long restrained by principles of moderation.* Cases soon arose, where the patrons altogether disregarded the wishes of the people; and church courts were soon found corrupt enough to sustain them in it.

A flagrant case of this kind occurred in the parish of Kinross, in the bounds of the Presbytery of Dunfermline. Sir John Bruce the patron, gave the presentation to a Mr. Robert Stark, a very unpopular nominee, to whose ministry, the body of the people could not be induced to submit. This case, according to a late historian, was one of the most scandalous intrusions that ever was made in a Christian congregation.† The Presbytery positively refused to take any steps towards Mr. Stark's ordination. The Synod of Fife, to which the Presbytery of Dunfermline belonged, with the aid of the Assembly, resolved, however, to settle him at all hazards. This case came before the General Assembly in May, 1732, and it, together with similar cases, which were now becoming more frequent, led to the adoption of an act at that meeting of the Assembly, "*anent planting vacant churches,*" in which the doctrine of patronage was recognised, and such settlements as that of Kinross were approved.

This act gave great offence to many godly people, and was regarded as violating the long received principles of the church.

In October following, Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, minister at Stirling, in a sermon preached at the opening of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, condemned with freedom and plainness of speech some of the prevailing sins of that time, and particularly the act of the Assembly of May preceding, "*Anent the settlement of vacant churches, &c.,*" referring to the Kinross and other cases.

The Synod took offence at the freedom with which Mr. Erskine attacked the act and decisions of the Assembly, and immediately took measures to censure him for the sentiments uttered in the sermon. This was the beginning of a series of proceedings which led to the secession and organization of the Associate Presbytery of Scotland, which event took place on the 17th of November, 1733.

The reader will at once see the connexion between the secession and the proceedings of the church on the subject of patronage. The seceding brethren who formed the Associate Presbytery maintained, that in condemning patronage and the decisions of the judicatories

* Struther's History of Scotland, vol. i. p. 599.

† Frazer's Life of Ralph Erskine, p. 190.

sanctioning the settlement of ministers in congregations against the consent of the people, they were only acting in conformity with the acknowledged principles of the church. They accordingly bore a very decided testimony against patronage. In a similar manner the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania expressed their sentiments on this subject.

“The revival of patronage was one of the evils which resulted to the church from merging the Parliament of Scotland into that of England, in 1707.

“The members of the British Parliament, being generally of the communion of the Episcopal church of England, and one class of them dignitaries in it, it was not to be expected they would act the part of friends to the Presbyterian interest. Accordingly, in the year 1711 [1712?], when a party who entertained a deadly hatred against the English dissenters, and against the Church of Scotland, prevailed, the Parliament grievously injured both, and took from the people belonging to the latter, the liberty of choosing their own pastors; restoring to some men of rank, or to the crown, certain rights, which they claimed from the laws and customs of popish times, to provide for vacant congregations such ministers as they thought fit.”*

There were, it is true, other causes of grievance at the same time that patronage was restored; but this was the most prominent, and the one which led to the secession and organization of the Associate Presbytery of Scotland, and that led to the organization of the Associate Church of North America. It may here be observed, that the main question at issue then, was precisely the same in all its important bearings, with the one which has issued in the great secession of 1843.

One other circumstance it may be necessary to state, in order to trace the origin of the Associate Church in this country to its proper source. In the year 1744 the Associate Presbytery of Scotland having greatly increased, it was judged necessary, for the sake of convenience, to constitute a Synod. But in the next year a controversy arose in the Synod, which issued in its disruption. The oath to be sworn by such as were admitted burghers, or freemen of towns in Scotland, had, in some places, this clause: “Here I protest before God and your lordships, that I profess and allow with all my heart, the true religion presently professed within this realm, and authorized by the laws thereof, that I shall abide thereat, and defend the same to my life’s end, renouncing the Roman religion called Papistry.”

* Narrative, p. 28, 6th edition, W. S. Young, Philadelphia, 1839.

The controversy turned on the point, whether it was consistent and lawful for dissenters, or those who had withdrawn from the national church, to swear this oath, knowing that it was the profession of religion in the national church that was intended by the government imposing the oath. Different sides of this question were advocated in Synod, and the disputes ran so high that, in 1747, the body divided, and each party claimed the name of the "Associate Synod." But the public soon affixed distinguishing epithets to each of the parties. Those who opposed the lawfulness and consistency of swearing the oath, were called *Anti-burghers*, and the advocates of the oath *Burghers*. It was with the former of these that the Associate Presbytery in this country was connected. The latter never had an organization in this country.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE ASSOCIATE CHURCH INTO NORTH AMERICA.

At an early period of the secession, individuals approving of the principles of the secession emigrated to this country, both from Scotland and Ireland. These not finding here any denomination of professing Christians fully concurring with them in their views of religious faith and duty, and wishing still to retain the principles of the Church of Scotland in their primitive purity, they petitioned the Anti-burgher Associate Synod of Scotland, to send over some ministers of the gospel to their assistance.

In compliance with this petition, Messrs. Alexander Gellatly and Andrew Arnot were sent over. The former with a view of permanently remaining in the country, the latter for a period of two years. They did not, however, reach the province of Pennsylvania, the particular place of their destination, until the year 1754. These brethren were authorized by the Synod to organize congregations, and to constitute themselves into a Presbytery, which they accordingly did in November, 1754, under the name of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania. Notwithstanding the various difficulties which they had to encounter in their first labours, these brethren had the satisfaction of seeing the ordinary evidence of success attending their labours; in a short time there were urgent applications for their labours from different parts of Pennsylvania, from Delaware, New York, Virginia, and North Carolina.

Mr. Arnot returned at the expiration of his appointment, and Mr. Gellatly was removed by death in 1761; but the Presbytery continued to increase by the arrival of missionaries from Scotland, until the

intercourse between the two countries was interrupted by the breaking out of the revolutionary war. By this time the number of ministers had increased to thirteen; and the applications to the Presbytery for supply of preaching and the dispensation of the sacraments increased in a still greater degree.

At this period it was judged necessary to divide the Presbytery. Those ministers settled in New York, with the congregations in that State and east of it, were set off into the new Presbytery, which was called the Presbytery of New York. The others remained under the old designation, the Presbytery of Pennsylvania, and had the care of such congregations as were located in Pennsylvania and southward of it. This division of the Presbytery took place on the 20th of May, 1776.

There were at this time also in the Province of Pennsylvania three ministers belonging to another body of dissenters from the Church of Scotland, called "Reformed Presbyterians." An attempt was shortly after this made to form a union between these brethren and the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania. After some twenty meetings of unsuccessful efforts, when the affair had been apparently dropped by both parties, it was unexpectedly brought on at a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, when the members were not all present, by the efforts of one of the members of the Presbytery of New York, and in violation of a former express agreement of the Presbytery, and carried by the casting vote of the moderator. The part of the Presbytery who at the time opposed the union, wished the matter delayed until the judgment of the Synod in Scotland could be obtained on it; but the others declared themselves no longer in connexion with the Synod in Scotland, and proceeded to pass censures on their brethren who did not fall in with the union. This event took place on the 13th of June, 1782.

The united body denominated themselves the Associate Reformed Synod, from a combination of the names of the two bodies from which the parties came.

This union, instead of making two bodies into one, as was its professed design, divided two into three; for those of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania who refused to join the union, believing the terms of it inconsistent with truth and of schismatical tendency, continued their former organization. Their course was approved by the Synod in Scotland; the Reformed Presbyterian Synod disapproved of what their members had done, and sent in other ministers to supply their place. So that the two original bodies continued to exist, and the new one also.

The Presbytery of Pennsylvania was almost extinguished by this union. At the meeting of the Presbytery at which the above transaction took place, besides the moderator, there were present five ministers and five ruling elders: three ministers and two ruling elders voted in favour of the union, and two ministers and three ruling elders against it. So that but two ministers were left in the Presbytery of Pennsylvania at the time, for the absent ministerial members at first fell in with the union; and for a time these two ministers, Wm. Marshall, of Philadelphia, and James Clarkson, of York County, Pennsylvania, with their elders, composed the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania. The Associate Presbytery of New York had joined the union previously.

The Synod of Scotland, however, as soon as practicable, sent over others to their assistance, and in a few years most of those who at first had joined the union, abandoned it, and returned to the Presbytery of Pennsylvania, so that in a short time her affairs began again to revive.

Nothing however worthy of special notice occurred in the Presbytery from this period until the formation of the Synod in 1801. During this period a number of ministers arrived from Scotland, and some were educated in this country. The first institution for the purpose of educating students in theology by this body, was established in 1793, under the care of the Rev. John Anderson, D. D., of Beaver County, Pennsylvania, who continued to serve as sole professor of theology until 1818, when he resigned on account of old age. From the appointment of Dr. Anderson, in 1793, until the formation of the Synod, in 1801, six young men had been licensed to preach the Gospel.

Before noticing the formation of the Synod, it is necessary to give an account of the organization of the Presbytery of Kentucky. The Presbytery of Pennsylvania, being wholly unable to meet the applications for preaching which were sent from Tennessee and Kentucky, directed the applicants to apply directly to the Synod in Scotland for missionaries. They did so, and in answer to the petition, the Synod sent two, viz., Messrs. Robert Armstrong and Andrew Fulton, missionaries to Kentucky, with authority to constitute themselves into a Presbytery. These missionaries arrived in Kentucky in the spring of 1798, and formed themselves with ruling elders into a Presbytery on the 28th of November of the same year, by the name of the Presbytery of Kentucky.

This accession of strength enabled these Presbyteries to form

themselves into a Synod. A resolution to that effect was passed in the Presbytery of Pennsylvania at their meeting in Philadelphia, May 1st, 1800. After setting forth the reasons for this, they "Resolved, that this Presbytery will, if the Lord permit, constitute themselves into a Synod, or court of review, known and designated by the name of the Associate Synod of North America. To meet in Philadelphia on the third Wednesday of May, 1801, at eleven o'clock A. M. That Mr. Marshall open the meeting with a sermon, and then constitute the Synod. The rest of the day to be spent in solemn prayer and fasting."

The Synod met pursuant to this appointment. The roll then consisted of seventeen ministers. These were divided into four Presbyteries, viz., the Presbytery of Philadelphia, the Presbytery of Charters, the Presbytery of Kentucky, and the Presbytery of Cambridge. At this time there were also several probationers preaching under the care of the Synod. Until the year 1818 appeals might be taken from this Synod to that of Scotland. But at that time it was declared a co-ordinate Synod by the General Associate Synod of Scotland.

From this period until the present time, this society has regularly increased in members and ministers. It is perhaps worthy of remark, that her members have increased in a greater proportion than her ministers.

About the year 1820 an attempt was made to form a union between this church and the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, who had separated from what was at that time the General Associate Reformed Synod, on account of the latitudinarian principles of the latter. A correspondence was carried on between the two bodies for some years, and nearly every obstacle to a union seemed to be removed, but the attempt was at length abandoned. This result seemed to be owing in a great measure to the nature of the last communication from the Associate Reformed, the tenor of which was unconciliating and unkind.

Between the years 1838 and 1840, six or seven ministers were deposed or suspended for various offences. These have since formed themselves into a Synod, and have assumed the name of the Associate Synod of North America. Two ministers, also, in the south, one in South Carolina and the other in Virginia, who had been suspended on account of their connexion with slavery, have also assumed the name of the Associate Church. These have united, or are about to be united, to the Associate Reformed Synod of the South. A minister of the Presbytery of Miami has also joined with

a suspended minister of the same Presbytery, and formed what they denominate the "Free Associate Presbytery of Miami."

These defections of ministers have consequently occasioned some reduction in the number of the people; but this loss has been more than compensated to the society by the peace, harmony and order that have since prevailed.

January, 1844.

HISTORY

OF

THE ASSOCIATE REFORMED CHURCH.

BY THE REV. JOHN FORSYTH, D. D.,
PROFESSOR IN THE ASSOCIATE REFORMED SEMINARY, OF NEWBURG, N. Y.

OF the earliest Scots' Presbyterian Churches in this country, we have no very certain accounts, with the exception of a few in South Carolina. In 1680, Lord Cardron took measures for the establishment of a colony in South Carolina, with the view to afford a place of refuge to his persecuted Presbyterian brethren. This was formed at Port Royal, and the minister of it was the Rev. Dr. Dunlop, afterwards Principal of the University of Glasgow. An invasion by the Spaniards, and the English Revolution of 1688, which afforded the exiles an opportunity of returning to their native land, led to the abandonment of the colony. Numbers of private persons, however, remained in Carolina, who were gathered into congregations under the care of a Presbytery which continued to exist until about the close of the last century. Of these churches, only one now remains, the Old Scots' Church of Charleston.

During that dark period of Scottish history, from 1660 to 1688, numbers of Presbyterians were* transported to the American plantations, and sold as slaves. Wodrow sets the number down at 3000. They were for the most part sent to Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. To a congregation formed of these exiles, in New Jersey, Fraser, the author of the work on Sanctification, for some years preached; he afterwards removed to New England, and from thence returned to Scotland. It is much to be lamented that the accounts of these Scottish Churches are so exceedingly scanty, inasmuch as their history is connected with that of the American Presbyterian and the Associate Reformed Churches.*

* Wodrow the historian corresponded with many of them for a long series of years; his correspondence, now in course of publication by the Wodrow Society, it is to be hoped will throw much light upon this early period of American Presbyterian history.

The earliest application to the Secession Church of Scotland for ministerial aid, was made very soon after the secession took place. In 1736, the Associate Presbytery received a letter from a number of persons in Londonderry, Chester County, Penn., requesting that an ordained minister, or a probationer might be sent to them, and promising that all the expenses of the mission should be defrayed by themselves. The condition of the Presbytery, however, was such, the demand for labourers at home was so great, as to render it impossible to do more than send to the people of Londonderry a friendly letter. (McKerrow's Hist. Seccs. i. 230.) The first minister sent out to America by the Secession Church, was the Rev. Alex. Gellatly, who arrived in 1751, and after a laborious ministry of eight years, finished his course at Octorara, Penn. The Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, sent out the Rev. Mr. Cuthbertson in 1751; he was followed, in 1774, by Rev. Messrs. Lind and Dobbin. As the Associate Reformed Church was made up of these denominations, a very brief survey of their history will not be out of place.

Of the Reformed Presbytery, it is only necessary to observe, that it originally consisted of those who objected to the terms on which the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was re-established at the Revolution of 1688; they considered that she had fallen from the attainments she had made, especially about the year 1646, and to which she was bound by solemn covenants. While they professed to rejoice in the blessings secured to Britain by the banishment of the house of Stuart, they still regarded the constitution both of Church and State as imperfect, and hence, while they refused to become members of the former, they at the same time declined to recognise the legality of the latter. Their most distinguishing principles, are those which relate to civil government. As these will be fully explained by a member of that communion, it is not necessary to state them in this place.

The Secession originated in 1733, and was occasioned by a sermon preached by the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, in which he strongly inveighed against certain recent acts of the Assembly having reference to the settlement of ministers. For this sermon (preached at the opening of the Synod of Perth and Sterling) he was immediately called to account, but refused to submit to the censure imposed, appealing from the sentence of the Synod to the General Assembly. The result was the secession from the Establishment of Mr. Erskine, together with his brother Ralph of Dunfermline, Mr. Wilson of Perth, and Mr. Moncrief of Abernethy, and the formation of a body known as the Associate Presbytery. Immediately upon constituting themselves into a Presbytery, they emitted a Testimony, in which they

declared that they had not separated from the Church of Scotland, but only seceded from "the prevailing party;" they appealed to the "first free reforming assembly" for an adjudication of their case, they declared their faithful adherence to all the Canons and Confessions of the church, and they particularly and strongly testified against the unsound doctrines, as well as the mal-practices which, for some years previous, had been creeping into the church. This testimony they required all who afterwards joined with them to approve; a step this, eminently injudicious, inasmuch as it was a large addition to the ancient terms of communion—bred among them a spirit of High Church exclusiveness, and was the remote cause of their subsequent unhappy divisions. In 1746 a dispute arose among the Seceders relative to the Burghers' Oath. By this time the Presbytery had reached the dignity of a Synod, numbering about forty ministers, and as many congregations. The point in debate was a clause in the oath required of those admitted to the freedom of the Royal Burghs, to this effect, that they professed the true religion as then professed in the kingdom, and "renounced the Romish religion, called Papistry." One party maintained that the taking this oath was inconsistent with the position occupied by Seceders; the other party held that there was no such inconsistency, inasmuch as the oath was no more than a recognition of the Protestant faith, as held forth in the standards of the Reformed Church of Scotland. The former were called Anti-burghers, and insisted upon making abstinence from the oath a term of communion, the latter were termed Burghers, and opposed any such restriction. The dispute, which was carried on with much vehemence and animosity, produced a division of the Synod into two distinct bodies, each claiming the name and the succession of the Associate Synod; but they were popularly known by the names just mentioned. The numbers were about equal at the time of the separation, and the growth of the two bodies in succeeding years was very nearly equal. The first effect of this breach was a change in the old Testimony to meet the new condition of things. There were, thus, in 1747, two Secession bodies, each having its own distinctive Testimony. In this state the Secession body continued until 1796, when the Burghers were again divided by a dispute respecting the power of the civil magistrate *circa sacra*. The subject had been in discussion for some years, one party (a very small one) holding that the magistrate was bound not only to profess the true religion, but also to maintain it at the expense and by the power of the state; the other, forming the large majority of the Burgher Synod, approached, in their views, very nearly to what has since been termed the voluntary principle, though

they did not absolutely condemn the principle of a civil establishment of religion. Connected with this question, was another respecting the binding obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant; the former party asserting the obligation of these ancient instruments upon posterity, in the strongest manner, the latter admitting it only in a very modified sense. This dispute resulted in the separation of a small party from the Synod, in 1796. They were called the Old Light Burghers; while the majority were known as the New Lights. In 1806, the Anti-burgher branch of the Secession was agitated by the same questions, and a small body, headed by Prof. Bruce of Whitburn, and the late Dr. McCrie, the eminent historian, seceded from the Synod, in consequence of a change in the Testimony on the subject of the covenants, and the magistrate's power, and formed themselves into a body called the Constitutional Presbytery; but the two parties were popularly known as the Old and New Light Anti-burghers. There were thus four distinct bodies of Seceders, all equally strenuous advocates of Presbyterian government and order; all observing the same forms of worship; and the ministry in each branch being equally distinguished for evangelical sentiment. Yet each had its own Testimony, an approbation of which was demanded as a term of communion.

To finish this brief sketch: in 1820 the two principal branches of the Secession, viz: the New Light Burghers and Anti-burghers, united themselves into one body under the name of the United Secession Church. The two Synods contained at this time about 150 ministers, each; their reunion took place just seventy years after the breach, and in the same building, Bristo Street Church, Edinburgh, where the division had occurred. Into this union the Burghers entered unanimously; but a small party of the Anti-burghers, with Professor Paxton at their head, refused to go with their brethren. These dissenters in 1827 joined the Old Lights, (Dr. McCrie's party.) While in 1837 the Old Light Burghers returned to the communion of the Established Church, thus leaving at the present time but two branches of the Secession, viz: the United Synod, numbering some 400 churches, and the Old Light Anti-burghers with 40 or 50.

The earliest missions to this country, were sent out by the Anti-burgher Synod. Having received in 1751, a very earnest application from Rev. Mr. Alexander Craighead, of Octorara, for ministerial aid, the Synod appointed Messrs. James Harne, and John Jamieson to proceed as missionaries to America. These appointments having not been fulfilled, the Synod in 1752, passed a very stringent "act concerning young men appointed to missions in distant places," to

the effect that if unwilling to go wherever the Synod might choose to send, they should no longer be recognised as theological students. In 1760, this act was extended to probationers, and it was enacted that probationers refusing to be sent to North America, by the Synod, should be deprived of their license; and in 1763, it was farther enacted, that no probationer, under appointment to North America, could be proposed as a candidate in the moderation of any call in Scotland. In our day, this would be deemed ecclesiastical tyranny of a high order; still it shows the exceeding earnestness of the Synod to answer the American call for help.

In 1752 Messrs. Gellatly and Arnot arrived; the former as a permanent labourer here; the latter being a settled minister in Scotland, and having been sent out for a special purpose, soon returned home. These brethren were charged by the Synod, to constitute themselves into a Presbytery, immediately on their arrival in Pennsylvania, which they did under the name of the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania. In 1753, the Rev. James Proudfit was sent, and after labouring as an itinerant for some years, was settled at Pequa, Pennsylvania. The hands of the Presbytery were strengthened in 1758, by the arrival of Rev. Mr. Matthew Henderson; and 1761, by the arrival of Rev. Messrs. John Mason, (afterwards of New York,) Robert Annan, and John Smart; in 1762, by that of Rev. William Marshall. In 1770 Messrs. John Roger and John Smith arrived, with instructions in reference to a subject which shall presently be mentioned.

The Burgher Synod received in 1751, a very earnest application for a minister from a number of persons resident in Philadelphia; this request was renewed in the year following, (1752,) with the promise of defraying all the charges of the mission. In consequence of repeated and earnest applications, the Synod resolved, in 1754, upon establishing a mission in America, and they appointed the Rev. Thomas Clark, minister of Ballybay, in Ireland, to proceed to Pennsylvania; but he was prevented from fulfilling the appointment at that time. However, in 1764, Mr. Clark, in company with the major part of his congregation, emigrated to America, and settled the town of Salem, Washington County, New York. He was followed in 1766, by the Rev. Messrs. Telfair and Kinloch. Mr. Telfair became the minister of the Burgher Congregation, in Shippen Street, Philadelphia.* Mr. Kinloch ultimately returned to Scotland, and was

* It may be here stated that the Shippen Street congregation, united with the old Scots' Church, in Spruce street, about the year 1753 or 1781. The ground in Shippen Street, is we believe, still used as a burial ground.

settled in Paisley. In 1770, he was called by the Old Church in Cambridge, Washington County, New York, but the call was declined.

The Burgher ministers appear to have had no desire to keep up a separate organization on this side of the Atlantic; they accordingly united, very soon after their arrival, with their brethren; but the union was disturbed by the refusal of the Scottish Synod to approve of it. In 1776 the old Presbytery of Pennsylvania was divided into two; the one bearing the old name, the other called the Presbytery of New York; this procedure was also condemned by the Scottish Synod, but no attention was paid to their order to rescind the act of division.

An attempt was made in 1765 to unite the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania to the Synod of Philadelphia and New York; the minutes of the conference held by the joint committee, of which Dr. Witherspoon and Dr. Mason were members, are now before the writer, but they are too long for insertion. The chief points of discussion were the ground and extent of the Gospel offer, the divine right of Presbyterian government, and the qualifications for the ministry. This attempt at union might perhaps have been successful, but for the animosities excited by a foolish publication of the Newcastle Presbytery, against the first secession ministers who came to this country.*

The Revolution of 1776 may, in one sense, be regarded as the cause of the union which produced the Associate Reformed Church. The importance of union among the divided Scots' Presbyterian churches in this country, had indeed been felt long before it was actually accomplished. The weakness of the congregations of the several sects showed the need of united effort; and the consciousness of this gradually excited and increased the desire for it, until the independence of the colonies, in the judgment of many, removed the ancient causes of disunion. During the progress of the war several conventions were held between the members of the Associate and the Reformed Presbyteries, with the view to attain this desirable end. A detailed account of these conventions would be of little use, even if we had ampler materials for giving it than we actually possess. It will suffice to say, that the three Presbyteries sat in Philadelphia in October, 1782, and formed themselves into a Synod, under the name of the Associate Reformed Synod of North America, on a basis consisting of the following articles, viz.:

* For fuller details see McKerrow's History, vol. i.

1. That Jesus Christ died for the elect.
2. That there is an appropriation in the nature of faith.
3. That the Gospel is addressed indiscriminately to sinners of mankind.

4. That the righteousness of Christ is the alone condition of the covenant of works.

5. That civil government originates with God the Creator, and not with Christ the Mediator.

6. The administration of the kingdom of Providence is given into the hand of Jesus Christ the Mediator; and magistracy, the ordinance appointed by the Moral Governor of the world to be the prop of civil order among men, as well as other things, is rendered subservient by the Mediator to the welfare of his spiritual kingdom, the church, and has sanctified the use of it and of every common benefit, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.

7. That the law of nature and the moral law revealed in the Scriptures are substantially the same, although the latter expresses the will of God more evidently and clearly than the former, and therefore magistrates among Christians ought to be regulated by the general directory of the Word as to the execution of their office.

8. That the qualifications of justice, veracity, &c. required in the law of nature for the being of a magistrate, are also more explicitly revealed as necessary in the Holy Scriptures. But a religious test, any further than an oath of fidelity, can never be essentially necessary for the being of a magistrate, except where the people make it a condition of government.

9. That both parties when united shall adhere to the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the Directory for Worship, and propositions concerning church government.

10. That they shall claim the full exercise of church discipline without dependence upon foreign judicatories.

Upon this basis all the members of the Reformed Presbytery, and all the Associate ministers, with the exception of two members of the Presbytery of Pennsylvania, (Messrs. Marshall and Clarkson,) united. A small minority of the people in the two communions also declined to enter into it. From these minorities have sprung the Covenanter denomination on the one hand, and the Associate on the other. The limits of this article preclude any extended comment upon this basis; it will be sufficient to observe, that at this distance of time it is difficult to discover the reason for inserting some of its articles. In reference to the extent of the atonement, the nature of faith, and the extent of the Gospel offer, there had never been any difference of

opinion among these parties; and it is therefore somewhat surprising that these topics are mentioned. There had been a dispute about *common benefits*, i. e. whether the common blessings of life were derived to mankind in virtue of Christ's mediation, or were merely bestowed by God as Creator. But a calm and candid perusal of the pamphlets begotten by this controversy—once deemed a very vital one—will convince any one that it was a dispute about words rather than things. Most of the articles, it will be perceived, relate to the subject of magistracy, and this was the grand topic of difference, viz. the essential qualifications of the civil magistrate, and the extent of his power *circa sacra*. On these last points, it must be confessed, that the language of the basis is by no means clear, yet it is perhaps as much so as its authors intended, and as much so as the subject admits. It should be borne in mind that each of these bodies held to the Westminster Confession, their catechisms were the same, their government, forms of worship and mode of administering the sacraments identical; their views of Gospel doctrine, and even the styles of preaching prevalent among them, were quite similar. Their differences had grown out of acts of discipline, rather than points of doctrine.

Here it may not be out of place to give some brief notices of the leading persons who were active in effecting this union. The *Rev. Thomas Clark* was one. Perhaps no minister of his day was "in labours more abundant" than he; and many interesting traditions are still in existence respecting him in various parts of the country. His public ministrations were marked by some eccentricities, so that he usually attracted large crowds to hear him. But he was a man eminently given to prayer, laborious, zealous, of a most catholic spirit, and he had many seals of his ministry, not only by his labours in the pulpit, but also by his private faithfulness, with all sorts of persons, at home and abroad. He longed for the salvation of souls; in season and out of season, he made full proof of his ministry. After a most laborious ministry of about thirty years (in this country), he died suddenly at Long Cane, in South Carolina, in 1796. He was the founder and first minister of the church at Salem, New York.

The *Rev. Dr. John Mason*, of New York, was one of the most accomplished preachers and pastors of his age. He "was a man of a sound strong mind, of extensive learning, and of unusually fervent piety. His scholarship was rare. He had so habituated himself to classical studies, that at the age of twenty, he spoke the Latin language on all the higher subjects of discourse, with equal ease and greater elegance, than his mother tongue. In Greek his proficiency

was but little inferior; and he was familiar with Hebrew. At the age of twenty-four, he taught logic and moral philosophy in the seminary of the Anti-burghers at Abernethy. His lectures were in Latin. As a preacher he was uncommonly judicious and instructive; as a pastor singularly faithful and diligent, and as a friend and companion he displayed an assemblage of excellencies rarely found in so great a degree in one person. Few ministers have ever lived in New York, in so high esteem, or died so deeply and generally lamented."—The following testimony of regard is from the pen of the late Dr. Linn, who knew Dr. Mason well:—"He had prudence without cunning, cheerfulness without levity, dignity without pride, friendship without ceremony, charity without undue latitude, and religion without ostentation."* For thirty years he was minister of the Old Scots' Church, (Cedar Street,) New York; he died in 1792, and was succeeded by his distinguished son, Dr. John M. Mason. He is said to have written, in connexion with Gov. Livingston of New Jersey, some powerful political papers, during the discussions that preceded the Revolution. Banished in common with other Presbyterians from the city during its occupancy by the British army, he acted as a chaplain to the American forces, and was very warmly esteemed by Washington.

The *Rev. Robert Annan* had been a fellow-student with Dr. Mason, and they came to this country about the same time. He was first settled at Neelytown, in Orange county, New York; and during the early years of the Revolution he was a very active promoter of the Whig cause. About the close of the war he was called to the charge of a newly formed Scots' church in Boston; but finding himself unable to carry out the discipline of the Presbyterian Church, he removed to Philadelphia, and for some years was minister of the Spruce Street Church. He afterwards accepted of a call from a congregation in Baltimore. In this his last fixed charge he continued about six years, when he demitted it in favour of the present pastor, Dr. John M. Duncan. He died in 1818. He wrote (with some slight aid from Dr. Mason) a short but very excellent exposition of the Westminster Confession; a narrative of the steps which led to the union; a tract on Universalism; one on civil government; and while resident at Philadelphia, he engaged in a discussion with the late Dr. Rush on the subject of capital punishment. He was a man of superior eloquence, an able, though a rather bitter controversialist; he seems to have been better fitted to lay the foundations of a congregation, than to carry up the superstructure.

* *Miller's Life of Rogers*, p. 164.

The *Rev. James Proudfit* was also educated for the ministry at Abernethy. His first settlement was at Pequa, Pennsylvania. After labouring here upwards of twenty years, he was called to Salem, as the successor of Mr. Clark, where he remained until his decease, in 1802. For some years before his death, his son, the *Rev. Dr. Alex. Proudfit*, was associated with him in the pastoral charge. He was one of the first Presbyterian ministers settled north of Troy, and for many years he was abundant in labours over a wide extent of country; not a few of the largest congregations in Washington county having been founded by him. He published nothing, but he was eminent for his holiness. A brother minister who had long known him, once said to his son, that "he was the holiest man he ever knew." So great was his acquaintance with the Bible, that he was often called by his friends *the concordance*. Of the Covenanting brethren, Messrs. *Dobbin, Lind, and Cuthbertson*, we regret that we are unable to give any certain information.

In this connexion it may not be out of place to give a few notices respecting the principal localities of the Associate Reformed Church, in these early days of her history. The earliest settlements were in Pennsylvania, within the Cumberland Valley. From these, colonies went forth to various parts of the United States. Numbers emigrated to west Pennsylvania, but in what year, we are unable to state,—we only know that these emigrants formed some of the earliest Presbyterian churches west of the Alleghany mountains. Some of the first settlers in Pennsylvania remained but a short time, and then removed to the upper parts of South Carolina and Georgia. The Old Church in Philadelphia, was formed by a few pious Scotsmen, who at first met together as a praying society. The Old Church in New York was formed by the separation of the Scottish members from the Wall Street Church in 1751, in consequence of changes in the forms of worship, and the neglect of Presbyterian order. In Orange county, a colony of Irish Presbyterians was established under the auspices of Col. Clinton, the founder of the Clinton family, so early as 1734; from these have sprung the various Associate Reformed churches in that county. Others were induced to settle on the Colden and Campbell patents. The first settlement in Washington county, was made by Dr. Clark; his congregation emigrated from Ireland about the year 1760: one part going to Carolina, another portion accompanying him to Washington county. To this day, this county is eminently Scottish in its religious peculiarities. It may be added, that the Associate Reformed Church was one of the first to plant the standard of the Gospel in the State of Kentucky; and at the close of the last

century the prospect of increase in that commonwealth was highly promising. These prospects were, however, soon darkened and destroyed by dissensions among the ministers. At the beginning of the present century, the Lexington Academy was founded under the auspices of the Associate Reformed Church. It was incorporated by the legislature of the State, and received from the same source the very handsome endowment of 4000 acres of land. Had the affairs of this institution, and of the church, been managed with ordinary prudence, there can be little doubt that it would now have been among the best colleges in the great valley of the West. But the opportunity was madly thrown away, and now it is irrecoverably gone. All the subsequent efforts of the church to extend herself in Kentucky, have been attended by no encouraging results.

In addition to these early settlements of the church, in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Carolina, and Kentucky, it should be mentioned that there were some in New Hampshire and Maine. Mr. Greenleaf gives some notices of them in his *Ecclesiastical History of Maine*. They were associated under the name of the Presbytery of Londonderry. The region, however, was unfavourable to the growth of Presbyterianism; so soon as the older generation was removed, their descendants became "like the people of the land," and degenerated into independency, though the name of Presbytery was still kept up. The consequence was, that the Synod in 1802 passed the harsh and unwise act, declaring this Presbytery no longer a portion of the Associate Reformed Church.

We now resume the history of the Synod. As before stated, it was constituted at Philadelphia, in 1782, and was then composed of three Presbyteries, and numbered in all fourteen ministers. One of the first acts of the Synod, after its organization, was, the adoption of a series of articles, which were afterwards published under the very unsuitable name of the Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church: among the people it was known as "the Little Constitution." These articles were vehemently attacked both by the Covenanters (in Scotland) and the Seceders here; yet they deserve attention as showing the ardent attachment of the men of that day to "the truth and peace;" they furnish striking evidence that they possessed a truly catholic spirit, and were eminently free from that mean and narrow sectarian temper which has often been displayed by those who make the loudest professions of universal charity. Our limits forbid the insertion of these articles; and we shall only say in reference to them, that the spirit of charity and moderation which they breathe, has been characteristic of the Associate Reformed Church from that day

to this; in no case has she attempted to profit by the dissensions of her neighbours, and with the single and noble exception of the Moravians, no other denomination in this country has ever displayed less sectarianism than she. Whether these articles were designed to serve only a temporary purpose or not, can hardly be determined at this distance of time; the fact, however, is, that they were ultimately laid aside for a fuller exposition of the church's faith—a measure that was probably owing to the uneasiness created in the minds of some weak but sincere persons, by the incessant and virulent attacks of the enemies of the union. The final result was, that the Westminster Confession and the Catechism, after a careful revision, at several successive meetings of Synod, in the articles relating to the power of the magistrate, were published in one volume, in 1799, under the title of "The Constitution and Standards of the Associate Reformed Church in North America," and they have continued to be such, down to the present day.

The ground occupied by the United Church was the same as that held by the Church of Scotland. The testimonies of Covenanters and Seceders were approved so far as they did not conflict; but the simple standards of the Church of Scotland were adopted as the standards of the church in the United States, only with a slight change of their language on the subject before named. And even this change amounted to no more than the incorporation in the Confession of the very sentiments expressed by the Church of Scotland on this head, in her adopting act of 1646. The Directory for Worship and the Propositions of Church Government remained unchanged; the Rules of Discipline and Forms of Process were not so much altered as drawn out into a regular system, the want of which the Church of Scotland has long felt; instead of rules she has only precedents for her guide in matters of discipline. In this connexion it may be mentioned, that various doctrinal acts were passed by the Synod, which were intended to oppose particular errors prevalent at the time. Of these, the acts on Faith and Justification, written by the late Dr. John M. Mason; on Original Sin, by the Rev. Robert Forrest, and on the Atonement, by Dr. Robert Proudfit, are very valuable expositions of Scripture truth, and have long been highly prized.

For twenty years after the union, the growth of the church was very rapid; in fact, the demand for labourers in all parts of the land, New England excepted, was far greater than the Synod could possibly supply. This rapidity of increase led the church, in 1803, to adopt a measure—under the influence of Dr. Mason, of New York—

which was altogether premature, and ultimately exerted a most disastrous influence upon her fortunes; this was the division of the church into four Provincial Synods of New York, Pennsylvania, Scioto, and the Carolinas, under a representative General Synod. The size of the denomination did not warrant this measure; the provincial Synods, held at great expense and trouble, found that they had no business to transact worth the name, and in a few years ceased to assemble; the affairs of the church fell into the hands of a few, and thus jealousies were engendered, the evil effects of which are felt to this day.

In 1800 it was resolved to take steps for the establishment of a Theological Seminary, as the only means of supplying the increasing demand for ministers; and in the meantime an effort was to be made to obtain a supply of ministers from Scotland. For these purposes, Dr. John M. Mason was sent as the agent of the church to Great Britain in 1802; he succeeded in obtaining funds to the amount of about \$6000, the largest part of which was expended in the purchase of a most valuable library; and on his return he was accompanied by five Scottish ministers, several of whom still survive. At the meeting of Synod in 1804, the plan of the Seminary was carefully framed; Dr. Mason was chosen Professor of Theology; and the sessions of the Seminary began in the autumn of the same year, in the city of New York. This was the first Seminary established in the United States, and for many years the most famous seat of theological learning in our country. The chief credit of its foundation, and especially of the admirable plan on which it was based, belongs to Dr. Mason. It is the model according to which all the other Seminaries of the Associate Reformed Church have since been framed. Of the character of Dr. Mason, his unrivalled eloquence, his rich and varied scholarship, his immense popularity, it is hardly necessary to speak. He is one of the very few American clergymen, whose fame is as bright in Britain as in the United States. Yet it is melancholy to reflect that his fame, once so great, is rapidly passing away, for he has left no durable monument behind him. The Seminary might have been such, but he, unfortunately for it, as well as for himself, undertook too much, and besides, lacked that indomitable perseverance which never rests until it has fully attained its objects. The Seminary which he founded, exists indeed in another place, but on the spot of its nativity it is now almost unknown.

Dr. Mason's writings deserve a high-rank in the theological literature of this country; but we have reason to believe that they are in no respect what they would have been, had the energies of his mind

been concentrated upon his duties as a theological professor. His earliest work, which was published about five years after his admission to the ministry, was upon the subject of Frequent Communion. For many years, in fact since the days of prelatic persecution, the Scottish churches were accustomed to observe the sacrament of the Lord's Supper not more than twice a year, and in some cases only once. Besides the usual preparation sermon, the sacrament Sabbath was invariably preceded by a fast day on the Thursday, and succeeded by a thanksgiving day upon the Monday. Palpably opposed as this was to the spirit of the Directory, which declares that "the Lord's Supper is frequently to be observed," the church had become so wedded to these "days," that it was deemed by many almost a profanation of the sacrament to celebrate it without them. Dr. Mason set himself to oppose these additions to the New Testament Passover, as he well knew that its frequent observance was impossible so long as they were continued; his "Letters," addressed to the members of the Associate Reformed Church, were the means of working the desired change in many congregations, though in some parts of the church "the days" are observed even to the present time. But the great work of Dr. Mason is his masterly treatise on "Catholic Communion," published in 1816. The circumstances which gave rise to this important work are given in the work itself, and need not be here repeated. It is a singular coincidence that its appearance was contemporaneous with that of the treatise of Mr. Robert Hall of Leicester on the same subject, and in which substantially the same principles are defended. Previous to the appearance of Dr. Mason's work, the practice of the Associate Reformed Church, in common with the other branches of the Scottish Church in this country, had been that of exclusive communion. We say that such was her *practice*, and it furnished a sad illustration how the practice of a church which glories in her orthodoxy, may be in palpable contradiction to her own standards. In the days of the Westminster Assembly the doctrine of exclusive communion was condemned, especially by Baillie and Rutherford, two of the greatest lights of their age, as one of the peculiar errors of the Independents, who would neither commune with other Christians, nor allow others to commune with them. The Confession of the Scottish Church asserts in the plainest terms the duty of communing with all, in every place, who call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, as God in his providence gives the opportunity. But at an early period in the history of the Scottish Secession an unchristian spirit of exclusiveness began to manifest itself; new terms of communion were framed, which had

never before been heard of in the Christian church; they assumed ground which was a virtual unchuraching of all other denominations of Christians; and they were forced to put a construction upon the language of their own Confession relative to the communion of saints, at war with the well-known sentiments of the Westminster divines, and almost too absurd to need refutation. The great aim of Dr. Mason's work was to expound and defend the doctrine of the church on this subject, and to bring the practice of the church into a correspondence with her own authorized standards. On this account, as well as for the influence which it was the means of exerting, it deserves an honourable notice in the history of the church. The appearance of this work gave great offence to those in our own and some other denominations, who either could not or would not see the difference between catholic communion and promiscuous communion, and an attempt was made to answer it; still it was the means of producing a happy change in the practice of a considerable portion of the church of which its author was a member. But candour requires the statement, that in some other parts of the church, the doctrine of exclusive communion is taught and practised. The discussion of this subject, connected as it was in point of time with an attempt to introduce a new version of the Psalter, greatly helped to increase those sectional jealousies which had existed for some years before. All the great interests of the church languished; the Seminary was becoming involved in pecuniary difficulties—a fact however no way surprising, when it is considered how sadly its pecuniary affairs were mismanaged. The ministers in the western States made loud complaints against what they deemed innovations on the ancient order of the church; these proving—as might have been expected from the very manner in which they were made—ineffectual, the entire Synod of Scioto at length, in 1820, withdrew from the superintendence of the General Synod. This was a step in palpable violation of the essential principles of Presbyterianism; it was a causeless dismemberment of the church. Those who adopted it did not pretend that the General Synod had sanctioned heresy; they could not pretend that their interests were neglected, for quite as large a number of those educated in the seminary at New York were settled in the western States, as in any other portion of the country. The only thing which furnished them with a show of complaint was the act of the General Synod allowing the use of a different version of the Psalms from that which had been in use in the Associate Reformed Church. But no attempt was made to force a new version upon unwilling congregations. Now it must be manifest to all that if

secession, or, in other words, the dismemberment of a denomination, be warrantable on such grounds, the foundation of such a body must be exceedingly insecure. All the old and sound Presbyterian writers, as Rutherford, Durham and Baillie, are agreed in maintaining, that the only proper grounds of separation are, the authoritative sanctioning of gross heresy, or the positive interference with the rights of conscience: nor will even these justify it, until faithful though unavailing efforts have been made to remove the grievance. The eminent writers whose names have been given, unite in declaring, that to secede merely because the supreme judicatory tolerates something which one party deems to be an evil, while perfect freedom is allowed to testify against it, is to be guilty of schism. The truth is, that the schism of which we have spoken is to be traced to that absurd longing after an absolute uniformity in the mere externals of Divine worship, which Scottish Presbyterianism derived from the Westminster Assembly; this, we are persuaded, more than any other cause, has cramped the energies and hindered the advancement of the Associate Reformed Church in the United States.

In 1821, the Synod of the Carolinas petitioned the General Synod to be erected into an independent Synod. The ground on which it was made was the great distance of the Synod from the place at which the General Synod usually assembled, and the consequent impossibility of their being represented in the supreme council of the church. The request was granted. For many years after that event, the Southern Synod could hardly be said to have grown; but within the last few years a more enterprising spirit has been diffused among its members, and the prospects of increase are more promising than at any previous period. The increase of the Western Synod may be said to have kept pace with the rapid strides with which the Western States have advanced in population and in wealth. At the time of their separation in 1820, the number of ministers did not exceed twenty; now it is more than one hundred. The details of their statistics we shall leave to the close of our article. Both the ministers and membership of the Western Synod are very strenuous advocates of what they denominate a "Scriptural Psalmody," by which they understand not merely a psalmody based upon the Scriptures, but the Book of Psalms, to the exclusion of all imitations such as that of Dr. Watts, and even of all translations of other portions of the Sacred Word. Not only are there congregations confined to the use of the Scots' version (as it is sometimes called) in the worship of God, but their ministers also are compelled to use this version when called to officiate in the pulpits of other denominations. Whether this subject

does not receive an undue prominence among them, is a question which it might be deemed improper for one to determine, who is in a great measure unacquainted with the circumstances of that branch of the church. However this may be, it is very certain that psalmody forms the standing topic of discussion in all the periodicals connected with the Western Synod, and is the theme of not a few sermons. They are also very strongly opposed to the doctrine of catholic communion; though it would probably be doing many of them injustice to affirm that they hold to the doctrine of exclusive communion in the strongest sense of the phrase. We are not indeed aware that the Synod, as such, has ever given forth any positive deliverance upon the subject of communion; but there can be no doubt that the practical sentiment of the majority of ministers and members is in favour of the exclusive system. Of late years the Synod has also taken very decided ground against slavery; in many of the congregations, we are informed, that, not only are actual slaveholders excluded from their communion, but even those who have ceased to be such, are refused, unless they express sorrow for their past sin in the matter. These remarks apply to the southern branch of the church also, except in relation to the subject of slavery. In the Northern Synod, on the other hand, while there are some who entertain the views just expressed on the subjects of psalmody and communion, yet the majority of its members hold to a more liberal way of thinking.

About the time of the separation of the Western Synod, a proposal was made to unite the Associate Reformed and the Reformed Dutch Churches, under the name of "The Reformed Protestant Church of North America." The cause of the failure of this projected union has never been very satisfactorily explained. In the report of the committee of the Associate Reformed Church, the coldness with which the proposal was received by some few of the classes of the Dutch Church, is given as the reason for their recommendation not to prosecute the business. But there must have been some more potent agency than this at work; it is well known that the pride of one very distinguished member of the committee of the Associate Reformed Church was, in some way, wounded in the prosecution of the affair, and there are those who ascribe to this circumstance—whether properly or not the writer cannot positively determine—the unhappy termination of the project. At the very same meeting of General Synod at which it was resolved to be inexpedient to prosecute the attempt at union with the Dutch Church, on account of the coldness of a few of her classes, a proposition of union was received from the General Assembly. A joint committee was immediately appointed,

and a basis of union was very hastily framed, and it having received the approval of the two bodies, was sent down to their respective Presbyteries for their action. Those under the care of the Assembly do not appear to have ever had the thing before them; at all events they never acted upon it.

At the next meeting of the General Synod, in 1822, it appeared that a large majority of the Presbyteries and Congregations were most decidedly opposed to the projected union. Yet, strange to relate, those very men whose consciences had been so scrupulous about the coldness of a few of the Dutch classes, as to deem it necessary to drop the project of union (a union be it observed worthy of the name) with that church, had got so completely rid of their scruples, that they resolved to proceed with another proposal of union, in the face of the expressed negatives of a majority of their own Presbyteries. The subject was debated for some days; when the vote was taken, there were for union *seven*, against it *six*, and silent *four*. The majority immediately declared the Synod dissolved; and in palpable violation of the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, they were at once admitted as members of an Assembly to which they had never been chosen. Within a week after this secession from the Associate Reformed Church, her valuable library was with singular expedition removed from New York to Princeton. We venture to affirm that a more disgraceful proceeding is not to be found in the annals of the American Church. The actors in this scene, besides having the expressed mind of the church of which they were the representatives, knew that their scheme would have been completely frustrated if all the delegates to the Synod had been present; they knew, at the very time the vote was taken, that several of these delegates from a distant part of the church were on their way. The indecent haste with which the library was removed from New York, and the silent manner in which it was effected, proved that these seceders were themselves conscious that their doings would not bear investigation. It is deeply to be lamented that the proposed union of 1822 was managed in the manner described. To an unprejudiced mind there appears no reason, on the score of principle, why these two branches of the Presbyterian Church should maintain a separate existence; their standards, their government, and their discipline are the same, and while there is a difference in some of their forms of worship, yet, as this would be no just cause for originating a separation, it cannot be a just reason for continuing it. Had the proper preparatory steps been taken, had due time been allowed the ministers and congregations of the Associate Reformed Church to consider the subject:

the writer believes that within a few years a happy union of the two bodies might have been effected. But managed as the business was, they were only placed wider apart than ever. Such, however, was the end of the General Synod, for it never met again;—ill advised in its origin, unprosperous through its whole existence, and miserable in its termination, it began in pride and ended in plunder.

The Synod of New York now resumed its ordinary meetings, and took the place of the General Synod as the supreme judicatory of the church in the northern States. But its members, unfortunately, wanted the vigour requisite in the existing circumstances of the church; the consequence was the irrecoverable loss of the old congregations in the city of New York. They even went so far as to direct their students of theology to attend the seminaries of other denominations, instead of appointing a professor of their own; the result was, just that which might have been anticipated, the loss of the greater part of these candidates for the ministry. At length, in 1829, the Synod awoke from this long and singular sleep; it was resolved to revive the Seminary, whose operations had been suspended in 1821, and to establish it at Newburgh, under the care of the Rev. Joseph McCarroll, D. D., who was at the same time chosen Professor of Theology. Steps were taken to recover the library transferred to Princeton in 1822; a representation of the case, marked by great moderation, was presented to the Assembly in 1830, which having proved unavailing, legal measures were adopted, and after a protracted suit, the library was obtained and removed to the Seminary at Newburgh.

From the preceding statement it will be perceived that the Associate Reformed Church, since 1822, has existed in three independent divisions, at the North, the West, and the South. An ineffectual attempt was made, in 1827, to revive the General Synod on the old footing; this failure was not produced by any of the old causes of disunion, for by this time, there was a uniform practice in all the details of Divine worship throughout the several divisions of the church; but it arose from the conviction which had been created in many minds, that in a country of such vast extent as ours, and with so many peculiarities of local interests and feelings, the affairs of the church will be much better managed by particular Synods, than by a representative General Synod or Assembly, having appellate jurisdiction. This sentiment, the truth of which is very remarkably established by the history of the Associate Reformed Church for the last twenty years, is gaining ground both at the North and the West; and we do not believe that any considerable portion of our church will ever consent to the erection of such a Synod, having appellate juris-

diction over the whole United States. This is, in fact, to carry the principle of Presbyterianism to an unwarrantable length; all the arguments adduced to prove the necessity of such Synods or Assemblies, if worth any thing, prove the necessity of a permanent Ecumenical Synod or Assembly. Recent events, especially the increasing agitation on the subject of slavery, convince us that the day is not very distant, when the other and larger branches of the Presbyterian Church in the United States will be compelled to take the same position, on this subject, with the Associate Reformed Church.

It only remains to add to this historical sketch, that for the last five or six years a correspondence has been going on between the Associate Reformed, the Associate, and the Reformed Presbyterian Churches, with a view to their amalgamation into one body. Among persons of right Christian feelings, and of enlarged minds, there can be but one opinion, as to the desirableness of such a union; but we are sorry to say, that at the present time, the prospect of its accomplishment is by no means flattering. Still, the parties concerned are acting with great caution, and experience proves that in all attempts at union, the dictate of true wisdom, is "*festina lente*." The great deliberation by which this movement has been distinguished, may at least inspire the hope that when the union does take place, it will be a union that deserves the name. And yet, if it were speedily effected, while we should greatly rejoice, the question would force itself upon us—why should the united Scottish Church maintain a separate existence in America? We confess that we should look upon this as a step towards a yet more blessed consummation. We should look upon it as the harbinger of that day, when Presbyterians, so long divided and alienated, though one in their confession and government, forgetful of their ancient animosities, shall unite their hearts and their energies against that common and mighty foe which is every day putting on renewed strength, that deadly foe by which in other days so many of our Presbyterian fathers were sent to join and increase "the goodly company of martyrs."

We shall conclude the article with the statistics of the church.

I. *The Synod of New York*, contains four Presbyteries, viz: New York, Saratoga, Washington, and Caledonia. The whole number of ministers is 34; and of congregations, settled and vacant, about 43. The Theological Seminary is at Newburgh, Rev. Joseph McCarroll, D. D., Professor of Theology; the Professorship of Church History is at present vacant.

II. *The Synod of the West*, about four years since, was turned into a General Synod, having under its care the following particular ones, viz:

1. The East Sub-Synod, containing the following Presbyteries: Big Spring, Monongahela, The Lakes, Mansfield, Steubenville, Blairsville, Second Ohio. The East Synod contains about 60 ministers, and about 100 congregations, settled and vacant. The Theological Seminary is established at Alleghany, near Pittsburg, under the care of Rev. John T. Pressley, D. D., Professor of Theology; Rev. James L. Dinwiddie, Professor of Biblical Criticism; the Professorship of Church History is vacant.

2. The West Sub-Synod contains the following Presbyteries: First Ohio, Chilicothe, Springfield, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan. It numbers about 40 ministers, and 70 or 80 congregations, settled and vacant. The Theological Seminary is established at Oxford, Ohio, under the care of the Rev. Joseph Claybaugh, D. D., Professor of Theology.

III. The Synod of the South, contains the following Presbyteries: First Carolina, Second Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee. The number of ministers is about 25, and of congregations 40. They have a Literary and Theological Institution, called The Clarke and Erskine College, in Abbeville District. The names of the Professors we are unable to give, though we understand the College is in a flourishing condition.

HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS.

BY THE REV. A. D. GILLETTE, A. M.,

PASTOR OF THE ELEVENTH BAPTIST CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

WHOEVER thinks of a noble river, as it flows in majesty towards the ocean, without contemplating the bubbling springs and mountain rivulets of which its deep channels are composed?

When we look upon the form and features of some distinguished and useful man, we naturally inquire, Where was he born? Who were his parents? What is the history of his childhood? and by what step in life has he gained that mental, moral and civil elevation, which places him so far above the thousands of his race?

On becoming acquainted with some benign institution, we ask, Whence its origin?—and listen to its history, or the narration of whatever is of moment in its character, with an avidity and interest which bespeak us engaged in no ordinary way.

Our divine Saviour asks, “Whether the baptism of John was from heaven or of men?” We know that the religion which John, Jesus and the Apostles taught, was from heaven. Christianity is no graft from some former tree, no remnant of some old religion, no substitute; but a new and living faith: direct from God—the love of Christ, and the mind of the Spirit; it is a system destined to glorify its divine authorship, and save the souls of such as repent of sins and believe its holy teachings.

It may in truth be said of any people professing and calling themselves Christians, that their principles are from the same source, provided they are according to the Gospel of God. This we fully believe concerning all evangelical Christian churches, irrespective of names.

The origin of Christian communities, their distinct organization, their history as separate societies, the progress of their sentiments among men, are subjects of curious and profitable investigation,

a fact which we are glad to find is receiving a degree of public attention, somewhat proportionate with its reasonable and legitimate claims upon the intelligent inquirer after truth.

ORIGIN OF THE SENTIMENTS OF THE BAPTISTS.

Mosheim declares the origin of the sentiments of the Baptists to be hid in the remotest ages of antiquity. Milner, the ecclesiastical historian, also shows, that the *sentiments* of the Baptists were held by the primitive church, and not departed from until the year 253, when Cyprian, an African bishop, decided, "That those whose weak state did not permit them to be *washed in water*, were yet sufficiently baptized by being sprinkled."

Church history shows us clearly that in every age since the Saviour's advent, there have been communities of Christians among whom were held most, and by some all of the peculiar doctrines of the Baptists of the present day: such were the Piedmontese, Waldenses, and disciples of Gundulphus.

When the Roman papacy sent its monks into Britain for the purpose of converting the people to the dogmas of their spurious faith: British bishops and congregations were found in great numbers worshipping God according to a pure Gospel, and administering baptism and communion to such only as lived a godly life, after the pattern shown them in the Holy Scriptures. These Christian people resided chiefly in the north part of the Island, among whom the "beast and false religion found no favourites." In the south, and among the Kentish people, most of whom were Druids or Pagans, the Roman mission was so far successful, as to persuade many to mingle with their heathen ceremonies others called Christian that were of Roman origin.

The early British Christians held all the evangelical doctrines as essential to church fellowship, and withheld the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper from bad livers and unconscious infants; maintaining that it was the privilege of believers only. And, as up to the fifteenth century immersion was practised in all cases except upon the infirm and sick: it was of course the unquestioned conviction of all, that our practice and sentiments in this thing were according to the Bible; for we now hold that baptism is immersion "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Also with those "ancients" we hold, "that true penitents and sincere Christians only are subjects of baptism."

It is understood by the most intelligent among us, that we are Pro-

testants only in the union of sentiment against the Papal heresy, and according to the great truths of the Gospel which we hold in common with all evangelical churches.

We, as a people, never submitted to antichristian Rome; but have given thousands of lives rather than be restrained from worshipping God, through the threats and power of wicked rulers; we never yielded to the "Man of Sin," except in dying by the power of its brute force, its inquisitorial cruelties.

The adherents of our views did not always separate themselves entirely from other communities, or from Christians who did not agree with them in these peculiar sentiments; hence they are not clearly distinguished in the history of early times, and seldom by the name of Baptists: a name we never gave ourselves, but one used by others to signify the primitive and gospel manner of imitating Christ in his divinely appointed ordinances.

Men of our views, such as Milton, and Bunyan, and others, stood high in office, and were embalmed in the affections of the people, who never enjoyed the privileges of a separate connexion, with our present organization and plans of benevolence.

Mosheim says, "In the middle and succeeding ages, there were individuals who professed Baptist sentiments, mixed up with the general body of Christians scattered over a wide surface."

REASONS WHY OUR SENTIMENTS AND HISTORY WERE SO UNKNOWN IN THE EARLY AGES.

The discipline and morals of the large national churches, in the third and fourth centuries, became so antichristian, that such as had the purity of Christ's kingdom at heart, after striving in vain to resist the heathenish innovations, withdrew, as they should have done, from churches no longer worthy of the Christian name. By the corrupted party they were soon confounded with heretics; the favourites of a corrupt government, and a worse faith, even sacrilegiously assumed the name "Catholic."

But the faith of those who retired by themselves was pure, their discipline scriptural, and among them we must look for the Church of Jesus Christ.

This people, in Rome, were called Novatians; in Africa, Donatists; in Greece, Paulicians.

The people holding Baptist or purely gospel sentiments concerning the ordinances of religion, are the people who, under various names,

given by their enemies, have in all ages of the Church, contended in argument and unto death, for the sole authority of the "Holy Scriptures," and have discarded as ruinous heresy, the bold assumption, that for human safety and convenience "the Church has a right to change somewhat."

Many writers upon Church History refer our origin to the *Munster-men* of Germany, a sect originating in secular causes, and proceeding to violence and insurrection; a charge to which we have not the mortification of assenting, having ever been a peaceable, and until within a few years, an every where persecuted people; even now, in Germany and Denmark, our missionaries are being fined, imprisoned, and opposed, and that too by a church and state which Luther is said to have *reformed*.

The Baptists in no land or nation ever returned "evil for evil, but contrariwise" they have sought peace and prosperity in the prosecution of their religious enterprises, asking of human authorities the boon of being let alone.

So far as we are informed, the *Munster-men* never baptized, but by sprinkling,—we never but by immersion; they long since ceased to be a separate society; we continue growing and flourishing like the cedars of Lebanon.

The Baptists of Holland, France, Switzerland, and England, and in all Europe, are well supported by evidence, in considering themselves the descendants of the Waldenses; who, though cruelly oppressed by despots and popes, have maintained visibility in the world, from the days of the Apostles, and whose residence has been principally confined to the fine valleys of Piedmont. They are found in communities of 800,000 at a time, refusing any submission to the Papal heresy, and dying by whole villages, rather than break their allegiance to Christ their king.

In 1120, this people say, "We acknowledge no sacraments as of divine appointment, but Baptism and the Lord's Supper. We consider these as visible emblems of invisible blessings. We regard it as proper that *believers* use these symbols, notwithstanding which we maintain that believers may be saved without these signs, where they have no opportunity of observing them."

Among their writings in 1120, is the following: "Antichrist seduces the people from Christ, teaches to baptize children into the faith, and attributes to this the work of regeneration: thus confounding the work of the Spirit with the external rite of baptism."

They "counted baptism of infants unnecessary, because they are not of age to believe, or capable of giving evidence of faith." They

refer to Tertullian as believing the same doctrine, and instance the practice of many of the ancients to be the same as their own.

A council was held in Lomber, in 1175, when and where the "men of Lyons" being condemned, one charge against them was, "they denied infants to be saved by baptism."

In 1179 the Waldensians were condemned by the Pope and council for "denying baptism to infants."

Mezeray, a French historian, says, upon the manner of baptizing in 1200, "They *plunged* the candidate in the sacred font, to show them what operation that sacrament hath on the soul." Farin says, "The Albigeos esteem the baptism of infants superstitious." Mosheim, Allix, Limborck, Gretzen, Montanus, Hassius, Bellarmine and others, none of whom were Baptists, make the sentiments of the Waldenses the same with those of modern Baptists.

In 1577, this people say to the French king, "We believe that in the ordinance of baptism, we are received into the holy congregation of God's people, *previously* professing and declaring our faith and change of life."

Wickliffe says, "As to children's estate as to salvation or damnation, he can say nothing what God will do with them; but for those who make baptism the thing to save them, and the parents' omission thereof to damn them, he utterly denies; because as God hath not appointed baptism to work grace or to regenerate, so it would be unreasonable, to charge damnation upon little ones for the parents' neglect." He adds, "believers are the only subjects of baptism."

It appears evident from the foregoing, that the history of the Baptists, is not the history of a people seceding from other denominations. Not Protestants properly so called, unless for having always *protested*; but they are descendants of a people who, much to the annoyance of Popery, have resisted all its seductive arts—have endured from it fire and famine and sword, and continued in great numbers, to charge the Man of Sin with having usurped the place, and power, which belong to God only.—Such people have held Christ to be the Head of his Church, the Scriptures the only rule of faith, and the "true church" to include all such as "fear God and work righteousness."

This proves that in various parts, as well as in England and America, the history of the Baptists, unlike most other churches, instead of dating from the Reformation, runs back to a distinct class of sentiments, held by a community, which early Welsh and British history shows, have existed ever since the days of the Apostles.

We want it distinctly to appear that we claim the existence of our *principles* and not our *name*. We do not say that a separate church

has been known as a *Baptist Church* from the Apostles, but that *views* and *practices* which we now hold, and which cause us to be called Baptists, were held by Christians in all past time; and they would be called Baptists were they now to appear in any part of the world.

“Church history,” so called, is mainly a history of the apostate Church of Rome, drunk with the blood of martyrs. The history of the true church, except a few scraps, remains to be written with human pen, but its “record is on high.” The history of papal power is no more the history of “the church,” than is that of George the Third the history of America:—against calling it such the Baptists conscientiously protest.

Mosheim has given a history of the primitive church, which applies to no body of Christians but Baptists. He says, “The churches in those early times were entirely independent, none of them subject to any foreign jurisdiction; but each one governed by its own rulers and laws. For though the churches founded by the Apostles had this particular deference shown them, that they were consulted in difficult and doubtful cases: yet they had no juridical authority, no sort of supremacy over others, nor the least right to enact laws for them. A bishop, during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly. In this assembly he acted not so much with the authority of a *master* as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant. Baptism was administered in the first century without the public assemblies, in places appointed for that purpose, and was performed by the *immersion* of the whole body in water.”

Robinson says, “All this time they were Baptist churches; and though all the fathers of the four first ages, down to Jerome, were of Greece and Syria and Africa; and though they gave great numbers of histories of the baptism of *adults*: yet there is not one record of the baptism of a *child*, until the year 370, when Galates, the dying son of the Arian Emperor Valens, was baptized by *order* of the monarch, who *sware* he ‘would not be contradicted.’ The young prince’s age is not given, and the assigning his illness as the cause of his baptism, indicates clearly that infant baptism was not then in practice.”

BAPTISTS IN BRITAIN.

Welsh and British historians show, that about sixty years after the Ascension of our Lord, the Gospel was preached in their island: many

of the royal family, and multitudes of the common people received it. They prospered, as the Gospel had free course and was glorified, or suffered, as the Pagans were disposed to persecute and destroy them.

In the sixth century, Austin, with forty monks, arrived there from Rome, and demanded that they and their bishops should receive three things—one was, “give baptism to your children.” All were rejected; whereupon this emissary said, “Sins then ye wol not receive peace of your brethren, ye of other shall have warre and wretche.” They add, “We have no mention of the christening or baptizing children in England, before the coming of Austin, in 597, and to us, it is evident that he brought it not from *Heaven*, but from *Rome*.”

“Baptist doctrines were held and practised in the recesses of their mountainous principality all along through the dark ages of Popery.”

God had a regular chain of true witnesses in that country in every age, from the first introduction of Christianity to the present time, who never received or acknowledged the Pope’s supremacy. “They were like the millions of the inhabitants of the vale of Piedmont, residing on green and fruitful meadows, surrounded by high and lofty mountains, separated from other nations, as if the allwise Creator had made them on purpose as places of safety for his jewels, that would not bow the knee to Baal.”

The British Baptists continued to multiply; and in 1689 they, with forty of their bishops, assembled in an association at London, and adopted a confession of faith;—the same was adopted by the Philadelphia association in 1742. Though the style is quite obsolete, yet as a “form of sound words,” it is the groundwork of many more recently constructed articles, which newer associations have adopted.

In the reign of Henry VIII., who was self-constituted “head of the church” in England, many Baptists suffered death by burning and other means, and many were banished; in Elizabeth’s time, they were imprisoned and executed; and in the reign of James, numbers sought safety by flight into Holland.

In 1401, William Sawtre, who was supposed to deny infant baptism, was the first to suffer death for his religion; and Edward Wightman, a Baptist, of Burton upon Trent, was the last thus obliged cruelly to die in that reign for our ancient faith. Baptists had the honour of both leading the way and bringing up the rear, of all the martyrs who were burnt alive; and many of the thousands who suffered death during the two hundred intervening years, were of the Baptist denomination.

Although taxed for the support of the National Church and greatly oppressed: yet the Baptists still remain in that island a growing and

highly respectable body of Christians, numbering about 2000 churches, having four colleges, and several religious papers; and to them alone belongs the unspeakable honour of originating, in 1792, the missionary concert for prayer, and the first successful mission to the heathen in India, which was begun under the supervision of Casey, Marshman, Ward, Fuller, Hall, and Pierce—an enterprise which has put the Gospel in the languages spoken by one half of the human family, and sent missionaries into almost all the other great nations of the world.

The English Baptists are congregational or independent in the constitutional government of their churches, and are protected by an act of toleration, in common with all who belong not to that church of which the crowned sovereign is the head.

Since the days of Bunyan, and long before his time, the Welsh, Scotch, English, and Irish Baptists, have been highly favoured in the talents and standing of their bishops and public men; and every rolling year shows that their sentiments are spreading, and their usefulness multiplying converts to Christ in great companies at home and in foreign lands. God is giving them great favour in the sight of the heathen; and of late their contributions, in proportion to their ability to do good to all men as they have opportunity, have not been surpassed by any other people.

Many of *our* excellent pastors, were born and religiously nourished by the fostering care of the English Baptist Churches.

BAPTISTS IN AMERICA.

When we recollect, that most of the early emigrants to New England came from their fatherland in search of “freedom to worship God,” we are not surprised to hear Cotton Mather saying “Many of the first settlers in Massachusetts were Baptists, and as holy and watchful and fruitful and heavenly a people as perhaps any in the world.”

“Early in the sixteenth century, in England, Sir Edward Coke, being in church, where lawyers went in those good early times, he one day discovered a lad taking notes during service. Being pleased with the modest worth of the lad, he asked his parents to permit him to educate their emulative son. Coke sent him to Oxford College. He drank from the fountains of knowledge, and in those draughts he found

‘The sober certainty of waking bliss.’

“ ‘As the hart panteth for the water brooks,’ he longed for the wisdom that rouses the might which so often and so long slumbers in a peasant’s arm. He communed with the past and with his own startling thoughts. He summoned around him the venerable sages of antiquity, and in their presence made a feast of fat things.

‘A perpetual feast of nectared sweets,
Where no rude surfeit reigns.’

“At the fount of holiest instruction he cleared his vision; and, from the mount of contemplation, breathed in worlds to which the heaven of heavens is but a veil.

“But his soul was too free for the peace of his sycophantic associates; his principles were too philanthropic for the selfishness of that age; the doctrines which he scorned to disavow, were too noble for Old England,—and he sought an asylum among the icy rocks of this wilderness world. He came, and was driven from the society of white men, through wintry storms and savages more lenient than interested factions, to plant the first free colony in America. That boy was the founder of Rhode Island; that man was the patriot who stooped his anointed head as low as death for universal rights, and ever

‘Fought to protect, and conquered but to bless;’

that Christian was ROGER WILLIAMS, the first who pleaded for liberty of conscience in this country, and who became the pioneer of religious liberty for the world.”—*Magoon*.

“Roger Williams justly claims the honour of having been the first legislator in the world, in its latter ages, that fully and effectually provided for and established a full, free, and absolute liberty of conscience,” says *Governor Hopkins*.

“Roger Williams possessed one of those rare minds, which looks upon truth with an eagle gaze, and what he saw clearly, that he maintained with invincible courage.

“But the war he waged was with ‘soul oppression.’ Having been a Puritan minister, he was driven from England by those persecutions for opinion, which, like the confusion of languages at Babel, drove men asunder, and peopled the earth. When Williams arrived in Massachusetts, he proclaimed that the only business of the human legislator is with the actions of man as they affect his fellow-man; but, as for the thoughts of his mind, and the acts or omissions of his life as respects religious worship, the only lawgiver is God, the only human tribunal, a man’s own conscience.

“Williams opposed the church membership right of suffrage, all law compelling attendance, and all taxes for the support of worship. Great astonishment and disturbance arose about their ‘ill-gotten egg of toleration;’ but the eloquent young Episcopal divine had won the hearts of the people of Salem, who called him to be their pastor. The court forbid it. Williams withdrew, and exercised with great celebrity the pastoral office in Plymouth for two years, when he returned to Salem, and was received with gladness by the people, to punish whom, the court withheld from the town of Salem a tract of granted land.”—*Mrs. Emma Willard.*

Williams complained to the churches of the injustice of the court; but that court disfranchised Salem until ample apology should be given. Williams then met the clamour of all; and even his own wife turned against him. But he declared his determination rather to die than abjure his principles. The court sentenced him to exile. It being midwinter, his earnest request to remain till spring was granted. Soon again the voice of Williams, their recently beloved pastor, was heard pleading for the emancipation of the soul from sin and from man’s dominion. Throngs listened with saving delight to him whom they expected would soon plead with and for them no more.

The court was alarmed, and sent a vessel to convey him to England; but he was not to be found. Williams was an exile: a wanderer in a wilderness and savage land,—in the cold of winter and on stormy nights,—had not “food or fire or company,—knew not what bed or bread did mean, or better shelter than a hollow tree.”

A few adherents joined him, and they stopped at Sekonk. Governor Winslow, fearing his remaining in his province would offend others, wrote to Williams, by Governor Winthrop, that he had better “steer his course to Narragansett Bay.” Williams embarked, and threw himself upon the mercy of Canonicus, a savage chief, who protected the wanderer, no longer sustained but banished by his Christian brethren.

Canonicus would not *sell*, but *gave* Williams all the land between Pawtucket and Mashassuck rivers, “that they might sit down in peace, and enjoy it for ever.” Regarding the whole transaction as the result of Divine overruling, they named their new home PROVIDENCE.

The Pequod or King Philip’s war ensued. Williams’s influence among the Indians kept other tribes from joining the enemy. He says, “The Lord helped me immediately to put my life into my

hand, and, scarce acquainting my wife, to ship myself alone, in a poor canoe, and to cut through a stormy wind, with great seas every minute, in hazard of life, to the sachem's house. Three days and nights my business forced me to lodge and mix with the bloody Pequod ambassadors, whose hands and arms, methought, reeked with the blood of my countrymen, murdered and massacred by them on Connecticut river, and from whom I could not but nightly look for their bloody knives at my own throat also. God wonderfully preserved and helped me to break in pieces the Pequods' negotiations and design, and to make a finish, by many travels and charges, the English league with the Narragansetts and Mohegans against the Pequods."

Thus by the influence of this "martyr spirit," this young divine, whose spiritual and political attainments seemed two centuries in advance of the world, were the colonies of New England, which had so recently exiled him, saved from falling a prey to the savage knife.

Williams was founder and first President of Rhode Island colony; he continued in that office many years; was several times ambassador at the court of England. He obtained a charter from the king, and stood high in the estimation of the civilized world and savage nations. None finally did him more honour than his persecutors, whom he requited kindly the cruelties he had received.

Though responsible for all the doings of justice in his colony, yet Williams ceased not to teach and preach unto the people whom he governed, and the natives near, the unsearchable riches of Christ. He made tedious journeys to other settlements as an herald of salvation to lost men. Having taken the Bible for his rule of doctrine and practice, he soon discovered that it taught no infant baptism, but required repentance and faith in all, and especially such as professed Christ, which must be done by being "buried with Christ in baptism."

Hubbard says, "Many of his people entertained the same views." There being no minister in New England who had been baptized by immersion on a profession of faith: in March, 1639, Ezekiel Holliman baptized Roger Williams, who then administered the rite to Holliman and ten others.

The course pursued was the best and only way, by which they, and persons shut out from access to all organized Baptist churches, could afford. Williams had been ordained by an English Episcopal Church Bishop, a *professed* successor of the Apostles; none, and certainly not our Episcopal brethren, will deny his "divine right" to administer the ordinance; and his Prayer Book required that he "dip the candidate

in the water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

Thus was founded, under Roger Williams, as Governor of Rhode Island, and minister of the Lord Jesus, and by Ezekiel Holliman, deputy governor, with ten others, the first Baptist church on the continent of America. To these members twelve others were soon added, and from that day to the present that church has been a burning and a shining light; by its instrumentality thousands have been born to live eternally. Among its membership and bishops it has enrolled some of the most eminent scholars, statesmen, jurists, and divines, that ever consecrated talents, time, property, and acquirements, to the glory of God and the good of mankind.

In 1638, Rev. Hanserd Knollys, an Episcopalian, fled English persecution for his Baptist views, and came to Boston; here he was opposed, so he left and settled in Dover, New Hampshire, where he preached for four years. He returned to London in 1641, and founded a Baptist church in that city, where he had crowds of hearers, whose pastor he continued until 1691, when he died in peace, at the good old age of ninety-three years. Dr. Mather, says, "He had a respectful character in the churches of this wilderness."

Baptist sentiments prevailed much in Boston vicinity about 1646. Records show that the popularity of sentiment against infant baptism was the chief means of calling a Synod of Congregationists, to compose a platform for the government of their churches. Hooker, the founder of Hartford, Connecticut, died too soon to attend; but he had published a book teaching, that "children as children had no right to baptism, so that it belongs not to any predecessor either nearer or farther off removed from the next parents, to give right of this privilege to their children."

In 1639 attempts to form a Baptist church in Boston were *legally* frustrated, and the society was broken up by the court. Five years later, a legislative act was passed, for the "suppression of the obnoxious sect;" but says Hubbard, "With what success it is hard to say, all men being inclined to pity them that suffer."

The "bloody tenet" was framed and executed upon the Baptists. Sir Henry Vane and Sir Richard Saltonstall in vain remonstrated, being then in England; and the people who had fled persecution in the old world, rebuilt its prisons, recast its bolts and bars, and rekindled its fires in the new world, and sought thereby to break down the consciences of their brethren for whom Christ died.

Dunster, President of Cambridge College, embraced Baptist senti-

ments, and lost his high office as a consequence. But his preaching against infant baptism enlightened the Rev. Thomas Gould, in Boston, who with others, in 1665, founded the first Baptist church in that city.

Rev. Thomas Dungan, in 1684, with others, formed a church in Cold Spring, near Bristol, Pa., but the same was dissolved in 1702. The ancestors and parents of Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia, were exemplary members of this church.

Penepack Church, ten miles north of Philadelphia, is the oldest in this State, and second on the continent, it having been formed in 1686. This church has continued flourishing and useful from its origin up to the present time. It dismissed members to form the first church in Philadelphia, which was the second in the State. These two churches jointly, for many years enjoyed the pastoral labours of the Rev. G. Eaton, Elias Keach, and others.

In process of time emigrants from the old country who were Baptists, and members of these first formed churches, planted themselves in Virginia, and in most of the principal towns of the colonies, so that quite a number of Baptist churches were founded in the seventeenth century. The first Baptist church in New York was founded in 1762; but from 1669 Baptist worship and an irregular church arrangement had been maintained in that city.

All of the first formed churches in the different States were fruitful vines, whose branches hung over the wall; they sent out members and ministers who planted much of the seed that has produced so abundant an harvest in the former and latter years.

Very early attention was given to learning by our churches. A Literary and Theological School was opened at Hopewell, New Jersey, in 1756; Rev. Isaac Eaton, A. M. was the president. Another by his pupil, Samuel Jones, D. D., at Penepack, in 1766.

Brown University, Rhode Island, was founded 1762. From these early nurseries of learning and theological knowledge came forth scholars, who mingling in with their less cultivated but strong-minded and self-educated brethren, the pastors in those times, laid a foundation for the prosperity and success which has attended our denomination's progress, under a similar and harmonious union of ministerial graces and gifts ever since. God grant that while the world stands, we may be as humble and prosperous, as uncorrupt in doctrine, and as holy in practice, as were the fathers of the Baptist churches in North America.

During the revolutionary war many of our churches were scattered by the male members being engaged with the army in defending the

rights of their country and religion. Many of the pastors acted as chaplains to the various regiments composing that brave band, who so successfully opposed tyranny, and resolving to die freemen, rather than to live slaves, established liberty throughout the land.

Of the Baptists, Washington says, "While I recollect with satisfaction that the religious society of which you are members, have been, throughout America, uniformly and almost unanimously, the firm friends to civil liberty, and the persevering promoters of our glorious revolution: I cannot hesitate to believe that they will be the faithful supporters of a free, yet efficient general government."

Under the new government, though in many of the States our rights were not equal to those of other denominations, we began rapidly to increase; and the prejudices which education and an exclusive pre-eminence, which some of the other churches enjoyed over us, was calculated to nourish, wore gradually away. Attention was soon turned to a vigorous use of means, calculated to increase converts to holiness and Bible sentiments. Institutions of benevolence were founded, adapted to facilitate the spread of a true faith and scriptural practice through the length and breadth of our land, and as far as possible to give the Gospel to a perishing world.

When we recollect that the force of education, habits and practices of all other denominations, are opposed to our peculiar views, and that a people are slow to cast off the influence of early prepossessions, and that we came in upon the community with our views, not until after other denominations had preoccupied their mind, by preaching and practising in a different way: we are led to believe that God is for us, and we adoringly ask, "What hath God wrought? He hath not dealt so with any people; and as for his judgments, we have not known them. Praise ye the Lord."

As organizations for the speedy fulfilment of our Lord's last command, we have an American Baptist Home Mission Society, which sends out ministers at its charges to preach the Gospel in destitute towns and settlements in various parts of the great Union, and has done much good, especially in the new western and southern States and Territories; one General Convention, for the prosecution of the same cause in foreign lands and among the American Indians; and no society has greater cause for gratitude than this has for the missionaries God has given it, and the success that has attended their consecrated and self-denying labour.

We have about seven colleges, and as many theological seminaries; numerous academies, high and select schools, under our

exclusive influence. Many of our educated members are engaged as professors and teachers in our general literary institutions. Others are bearing a part in the responsibility and usefulness which their various talents impose upon them, in the estimation of their fellow-citizens, and the different offices of trust and honour which they are called upon to fill in our state or national government.

In most of the States we have *conventions* for the purpose of promoting education, Sunday-schools, and missionary labour—contemplating the supply of those who are destitute of the means of grace, and aiding small and pecuniarily weak churches in supporting competent and acceptable pastors, and other means of usefulness to the people in their immediate or remote vicinity.

Associations of churches in a single county or district of a State are voluntarily formed for social and benevolent action, as the circumstances of their vicinity or the ardour of their piety may demand. Every church being independent, associations have no control over the doctrine or practice of the churches composing the body. Councils can only give advice, and recommend the continuance or withdrawal of fellowship from churches, as they may be worthy or unworthy.

We publish about twenty-five religious periodicals; one quarterly review. We have one National Bible Society, which contemplates mainly, as its field of labour, the supply of the heathen with such translations of the Scriptures as our missionaries shall in faithfulness prepare for them.

Through these benevolent channels about five hundred thousand dollars annually flow from our communicants, who in addition to these contributions support their own pastors, poor members, Sabbath-schools and other efforts of usefulness in the individual congregations.

We suppose about four millions of American citizens are dependent on the Baptists for the religious discipline and teaching which they receive, and with the rapid increase of population our responsibilities will also be increased. To meet and supply these solemn wants, we have about *nine thousand* churches, six thousand ministers; and with nearly one hundred thousand increase since our last statistical information, we have about one million of members—all of whom profess to be followers of the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world.

We have one General Publication Society, for the purpose of circulating books and tracts adapted to the wants of our members, and to become the means of salvation to the perishing, among whom we are commanded to shine as lights in the world.

Such an array of numbers calling themselves Christians, and such organized instrumentalities for the furtherance of their views among men, can but impress the pious of all denominations with the importance of praying for us, that we become not corrupt in doctrine or practice, but maintain the true faith, and continue, with them, that Christlike spirit of co-operation in opposing the kingdom of sin and error, and establishing in all lands the empire of our common Emanuel.

For this may we pray, and to this end may we labour, until the period shall arrive when the relationship of different denominations and official or organized agencies in the church below, shall be absorbed in the adoring views which we shall then enjoy of Him whose fulness filleth all in all.

FREEWILL BAPTISTS.

BY THE REV. PORTER S. BURBANK, A. M., HAMPTON, N. H.

FROM the early period in this country's history when *Baptists* came to be a distinct branch of the Christian Church in America, at the banishment of Roger Williams from the Massachusetts Colony, and his settlement in Rhode Island, different views of the Atonement and Christian Theology generally, have obtained among them; some inclining to Calvinistic, others to Arminian, sentiments. The first Baptist Church in America was of general views, and the Baptists in several of the states were Arminian long before the Freewill Baptist Connexion arose, while others were Calvinistic. As Calvinism became more and more introduced, some churches of general sentiment went down, others went over; others still, were inclined to the Arminian side, but co-operated with those churches which were Calvinistic; and generally there was but one denomination of Baptists in America till the origin of the Freewill Baptists, a little more than sixty years ago. This article on the "*Freewill Baptists*" will embrace summary sketches of their *origin* and *history*, *doctrine* and *usages*, and *present statistics*.

I. ORIGIN AND HISTORY.

The Freewill Baptist Connexion in North America commenced A. D., 1780, in which year its first church was organized. ELDER BENJAMIN RANDALL, more than any other man, in the providence of God, may be regarded the founder of this denomination. He was born in Newcastle, N. H., in 1749, where he lived until of age, during which time he obtained a good mercantile and English education. From a child he was much accustomed to serious meditation and deep religious impressions. He did not, however, experience a change of heart until his 22d year, when the distinguished George Whitefield was the instrument, under God, of his awakening and conversion. It was not long before he became convinced, in spite of his early education, that believers, and they only, were the proper subjects for

Christian baptism, and that immersion was the only scriptural mode. He was baptized in 1776, and united with the Calvinistic Baptist Church in Berwick. Very soon after this he commenced preaching; and within the first year he saw quite a revival under his preaching, in his own native town. It will be proper here to remark, that Mr. Randall possessed strong and brilliant powers of mind; and though he was not liberally nor classically instructed, yet with a good English education to set out with, by close application and untiring diligence, in a few years he came to be well informed in general knowledge, and especially in biblical literature and practical theology; to which may be added a clear knowledge of human nature, and deep and fervent spirituality. His soul also drank deeply into the doctrine of a *full* and *free* salvation. From Newcastle and adjoining towns, where he both met with violent opposition and saw many souls converted, he extended his labours more into the country, and himself soon removed to New Durham. There a great revival commenced under his labours. The work spread also into adjacent towns. About this time Mr. Randall was several times called to account for his errors, that is, Anti-Calvin sentiments. In one of these public meetings, held July 1779, at the close of the discussions, it was publicly announced by the leading minister, that he had "no fellowship with Brother Randall in his principles." To which Mr. Randall immediately responded: "It makes no difference to me, who disowns me, so long as I know that the Lord owns me: and now let that God be God, who answers by fire; and that people be God's people, whom He owneth and blesseth." In this way was Mr. Randall pushed out, and forced to stand by himself alone. The same year the church in Loudon and Canterbury, with its minister, and the church in Strafford and minister, protested against Calvinism and stood independent, until at an early period they came into the new connexion. By these ministers Mr. Randall was ordained, in March, 1780; and on 30th June, same year, he organized, in New Durham, the first Freewill Baptist Church. "This," in his own words, "is the beginning of the now large and extensive connexion called *Freewill Baptists*."

The gospel which Elder Randall preached was one of a free and full salvation; and he seemed to preach it with a holy unction, in demonstration of the spirit and in power. He believed that men possessed minds free to will and to act, and that God's exercise of pardoning grace was always compatible with man's free volition; that the gospel invitations were to all men; that the Holy Spirit enlightens and strives with all, and in a general rather than a partial atonement; that Christ invites all freely to come to him for life, and that God

commands all men every where to repent. Such were the views of this man of God, such are the Freewill Baptist sentiments now. In the true spirit of a faithful ambassador for Christ, commissioned of God rather than by men, he went forth into the great gospel vineyard, preaching to and praying his fellow-men to be reconciled to God; and the Lord abundantly sealed his ministry. For a while he went on to baptize, adding the converts to the New Durham Church; but soon there were several churches associated with this. It will be proper here to remark, that at the time of the origin of the Freewill Baptists, evangelical piety and the life and power of godliness were at a very low ebb in the two leading denominations in this section of the country. In the Calvin Baptist—we speak generally—there was much of real Antinomianism; much was preached of unconditional election and reprobation, and but little to the impenitent upon immediate repentance and seeking religion;—and in the Congregationalist, experimental religion, in many cases, was scarcely considered a prerequisite to church-membership or to entering the ministry. Churches were in a lax state of discipline, and much of the preaching was little else than dull moral essays, or prosy disquisitions on abstract doctrines. Any reader, at all acquainted with the history of the Church at the period of which mention is here made, will admit the full truth of our statement; while, on the other hand, we take much pleasure in informing the reader that these remarks, in our opinion, have no application whatever, at the present time, to these now truly evangelical and pious denominations. Such then being much of the preaching of the times, it was to have been expected that the preaching of Elder Randall and the other pioneers with him in the cause of *free salvation*, should occasion much excitement; their sentiments and measures be the subjects of frequent discussion and various opinions; that some would fall in with them, while others would oppose and deride. All these results actually followed. Publishing a full atonement, and gospel salvation free for all to embrace, and exhorting their hearers immediately to turn to God, the Lord working with them: many accepted the glad tidings and embraced religion. Revivals spread. Several ministers and some churches came out from other denominations and united with the new connexion; other ministers were raised up and churches organized, as the reformation extended. One of the first four ministers was liberally and theologically educated. The new sect was every where spoken against; fanaticism, delusion, wildfire, was the cry; and by their enemies they were variously styled, Randallites, General Provisioners, New-Lights, Freewillers, etc. Elder Randall

had already established large churches in Tamworth and in Stratford, in addition to those above named. The little vine soon ran over the wall—and in less than two years several churches were organized in the State of Maine, and their whole number was nine. In the fall of 1781, he made an eastern tour, and preached in several towns west of, and on, the Kennebec river, in most of which places he saw revivals commence, having in thirty-seven days preached forty-seven times, and travelled four hundred miles. Churches and ministers continuing to multiply—for the purposes of preserving unanimity of views and co-operation of efforts, and for mutual edification, a *quarterly meeting* was organized in four years from the first church organization. The quarterly meeting was held four times a year, in places which would best accommodate the churches, and its sessions continued two or three days. At these meetings the churches all represented themselves both by letters and delegates, all the ministers usually attending and many of the private brethren. In these sessions the state of the churches was ascertained every three months, the business of the denomination was harmoniously transacted, and several sermons preached before full assemblies. They were almost always the means of religious awakenings. In connexion with the quarterly meeting a ministers' conference was held, in which doctrinal views were compared, Scriptures explained, and good instruction imparted to the younger portion of the ministry. Printed circulars were sent out to the churches, stirring them up to gospel holiness and active piety. These associations were found to be a rich blessing to the Freewill Baptist interest, and they have always been continued, until, instead of one, there are now ninety-five quarterly meetings.

Although the early ministers in the Freewill Baptist denomination had the pastoral care of some church in particular, their services were not wholly given to their particular charge; many effectual doors were opened to receive the gospel, numerous Macedonian cries for help were heard, and many of them travelled much. Elder Randall travelled extensively, and preached continually. At one place in his diary he says, "I have travelled this year more than twelve hundred miles in the service of truth, and attended above three hundred meetings." Stinchfield, Buzzell, and others also, itinerated extensively. In the first twelve years of the connexion, Freewill Baptists had come to be quite numerous in New Hampshire and Maine, had extended into Vermont, and soon after Rhode Island and several other States. Several quarterly meetings were already constituted, distinct, yet acting in concert by messengers and cor-

respondence.' For the glory of God and the welfare of the increasing denomination, a *yearly meeting* was agreed on, which should embrace all the quarterly meetings in a general association, and present an opportunity for all parts of the connexion to be directly heard from and represented once a year. The first yearly meeting was held in New Durham on the 9th, 10th, and 11th of June, 1792; "a season of great blessing and long to be remembered." It was next held in Gorham, then in Parsonsfield, and so in turn at different places as would best accommodate the Freewill Baptist community. As the quarterly meetings were composed of churches, and transacted their general and relative business: so the yearly meeting was composed of the several quarterly meetings, through their delegates, and transacted the general business of the denomination. This organization was also found to be of great advantage, and has been continued, there being now twenty such associations. Elder Randall died in 1808; his last written advice to his beloved connexion contains much excellent instruction. At the time when God called from Zion's walls him who was the founder, and who had for so many years been the leading actor in the connexion: its numbers and its ministry had greatly increased, and many of them were able ministers of the gospel of Christ, whose names would often come up, in a full history of the denomination, but need not in our brief article. They have now extended into several other States in the Union, and into Canada. No other Freewill Baptist minister has ever been so successful as an evangelist, or so extensively instrumental in publishing a free gospel in the more distant States, as Elder John Colby. He entered the ministry in 1809; preached a few years with great success in several of the eastern States, in one of which years he baptized three hundred. But the great West seemed constantly to rest on his mind with such impressions to preach the gospel of Christ in that vast field, as he could not well resist. Accordingly he spent much of his precious ministry in several of the western States, and particularly in Ohio. Of the eastern States, Rhode Island richly shared in his successful labours. He died in Norfolk, Virginia, 1817, after an extensively useful ministry; having baptized many hundreds, established and set in order numerous churches, and laid the foundation for several quarterly meetings in States then new ground to the denomination.

It ought to be mentioned, in this connexion, that the Freewill Baptist interest had not arisen and come down to this period without some internal trials. There obtained among them, at one time, some difference of sentiment in reference to the divinity of Christ.

Some few of the churches and several ministers had imbibed Arian or Unitarian views, to the great grief of the general body. Several ministers, who afterward figured considerably in the Christian connexion, though Smith and some of the rest have never belonged to the Freewill Baptists, drew several of our ministers and a few churches into Unitarian views, and, in some instances, into the annihilation doctrine, both of which were not regarded as scriptural or the sentiment of the connexion. A small secession was the result on the one hand, and on the other, unanimity of sentiment was restored. The Freewill Baptists have always been, and are, Trinitarian. The above trial was not long felt, and it is presumed that others do not require to be mentioned in the present article.

The Freewill Baptist denomination having now extended over a large portion of the country, and there being several yearly meetings, and the whole body being represented in no one of them: a *General Conference* was organized in 1827, in which the whole connexion should be represented. The General Conference was at first an annual, then a biennial, and now a triennial association. It is composed of delegates appointed by the twenty yearly meetings, and to it are referred the general interests of the denomination, at home and abroad. Since 1827, the period last mentioned, the Freewill Baptist interest has been constantly extending, and their numbers augmenting, not so rapidly as in some of the sister denominations, but in a good ratio. Of course for a long time they had to struggle with the numerous obstacles universally common to all new causes. From the first they have not, so much as older denominations, enjoyed the advantages of an extensive and liberal education. The harvest seemed truly great; souls were perishing; and many young men whom God called to preach, felt constrained to enter upon the great work without waiting a long time to acquire a regular education;—they have been eminently pious, the means of turning many to God, yet not so extensively useful as they would have been in the enjoyment of better early advantages. Intelligence, however, has for some years been, and is, increasing, both in the ministry and membership. From their origin the *press* has, more or less, been brought in to aid them. First, only their minutes and circulars, with occasional sermons, were published. Afterward, for several years, Buzzell's Magazine, a Freewill Baptist Register, and other periodicals, were published; and occasionally such books were printed as the wants of the connexion demanded. For some twenty years last past the "Morning Star," the principal organ of the denomination, has made its weekly visits among them with an extensive circulation,

and has accomplished for the cause a great amount of good. Though they regard the Holy Scriptures as their only rule of faith and practice, they have found it to their great advantage to publish, some years ago, a Treatise of their Faith, which combines, summarily, the doctrines and usages of the connexion. Standard hymn-books, works on the Freedom of the Will, General Atonement, Divinity of Christ, Free Communion, Baptism, etc., memoirs of Randall, Colby, etc., have been published, and a complete History of the Freewill Baptists is now printing; and there is lately issued from the press a theological volume, by the principal of their Biblical School. Works and authors, though not numerous, are increasing among them. Though the Freewill Baptist ministry generally are not so learned as it were desirable, many of them having to pick up much of their biblical knowledge as they preach, there is now in the ministry quite a number of liberally educated men, and this number is yearly increasing. They have one Biblical School and several flourishing academies; and it may be safely said, that their ministry is becoming better and better educated.

The Freewill Baptists have arisen, essentially, by religious revivals; by conversions and accessions from such as were "without," rather than by secessions from other denominations. Protracted meetings, and their quarterly and yearly associations, have been blessed of God, as well as the ordinary means of grace. Last year about two and a half thousands of Free Baptists in the State of New York united with them. But they have never adopted a policy particularly calculated to increase their numbers. They would have numbered thousands of communicants more than they now do, but for their uncompromising anti-slavery position; having withdrawn connexion some years since from four thousand in North Carolina on account of their being slaveholders; and having refused, on the same principle, to receive into the connexion some twelve thousand from Kentucky and vicinity, who sent a delegation, four years since, to the General Conference for that purpose. As a denomination, they have no connexion whatever with the horrid system of slavery; the General Conference, Yearly, and Quarterly Meetings, having taken a strong and decided anti-slavery ground. Thence the reason why there are no more Freewill Baptists in the slave-holding states. The *General Baptists* of England are in their sentiments and usages with us, and a correspondence and exchange of publications, have been carried on for many years; and their Foreign Missionaries, and ours, in Orissa, in part, co-operate together. Our connexion have warmly espoused, and are zealously supporting, the various religious enterprises of the age.

Finally—The Freewill Baptist denomination considers itself a humble branch of the great Christian Church, a lesser tribe of the true Israel of God; but purposes to do all it can for the salvation of immortal souls, and the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom among men.

II. DOCTRINE AND USAGES.

The Scriptures.—The Holy Scriptures, embracing the Old and New Testaments, were given by inspiration of God, and constitute the Christian's perfect rule of faith and practice.

Of God.—There is only one true and living God, who is a spirit, self-existent, eternal, immutable, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, independent, good, wise, just, and merciful; the creator, preserver, and governor of the universe; the redeemer, saviour, sanctifier, and judge of men; and the only proper object of divine worship: He exists in three persons, offices, distinctions or relations,—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which mode of existence is above the understanding of finite men.

Of Christ.—The Son of God possesses all divine perfections, which is proven from his titles: true God, great God, mighty God, God over all, etc.; his attributes: eternal, unchangeable, omniscient, etc., and from his works. He is the only incarnation of the Divine Being.

Of the Holy Spirit.—He has the attributes of God ascribed to him in the Scriptures; is the sanctifier of the souls of men, and is the third person in the Godhead.

Of Creation.—God created the world and all it contains for his own glory, and the enjoyment of his creatures; and the angels, to glorify and obey Him.

Of man's primitive state, and his fall.—Our first parents were created in the image of God, holy and upright and free; but, by yielding to temptation, fell from that state, and all their posterity with them, they then being in Adam's loins; and the whole human family became exposed to temporal and eternal death.

Of the Atonement.—As sin cannot be pardoned without a sacrifice, and the blood of beasts could never actually wash away sin, Christ gave himself a sacrifice for the sins of the world, and thus made salvation possible for all men. Through the redemption of Christ man is placed on a second state of trial; this second state so far differing from the first, that now men are naturally inclined to transgress the commands of God, and will not regain the image of God in holiness but through the atonement by the operation of the Holy

Spirit. All who die short of the age of accountability are rendered sure of eternal life. Through the provisions of the atonement all are abilitated to repent of their sins and yield to God; the Gospel call is to all, the Spirit enlightens all, and men are agents capable of choosing or refusing.

Regeneration is an instantaneous renovation of the soul by the Spirit of God, whereby the penitent sinner, believing in and giving all up for Christ, receives new life, and becomes a child of God. This change is preceded by true conviction, repentance of, and penitential sorrow for, sin; it is called in Scripture, being born again, born of the Spirit, passing from death unto life. The soul is then *justified* with God.

Sanctification is a setting apart the soul and body for holy service, an entire consecration of all our ransomed powers to God; believers are to strive for this with all diligence.

Perseverance.—As the regenerate are placed in a state of trial during life, their future obedience and final salvation are neither determined nor certain; it is however their duty and privilege to be steadfast in the truth, to grow in grace, persevere in holiness, and make their election sure.

Immediately after *death*, men enter a state of happiness or misery, according to their character. At some future period, known only to God, there will be a *resurrection* both of the righteous and the wicked, when there will be a general *judgment*, when all will be judged according to the deeds done in the body; the righteous be admitted into eternal happiness, and the wicked assigned to eternal misery.

These are the Freewill Baptist views of the principal points of Bible doctrine.

The Church, Ordinances, Ministry.—A Christian church is an assembly of persons who believe in Christ, and worship the true God agreeably to his word. In a more general sense, it signifies the whole body of real Christians throughout the world. The church being the body of Christ, none but the regenerate, who obey the gospel, are its real members. Believers are received into a particular church, on their giving evidence of faith, covenanting to walk according to the Christian rule, and being baptized. The *ordinances* of the church are two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism is an *immersion* of the candidate in water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; the only proper candidate being one who gives evidence of a change of heart. *Communion* is a solemn partaking of bread and wine in commemoration of the

death and sufferings of Christ. The Freewill Baptists are free communionists, extending an invitation to all members of regular standing in any of the evangelical denominations. The officers in the church are two, elders and deacons. The duty of elders, bishops or ministers, which office by either of these names includes pastors and evangelists, is to preach, administer the ordinances, and take the pastoral care of the church. Ministers are to consecrate themselves wholly to their calling, and to be sustained by the churches. No grade is acknowledged in the Christian ministry. The province of deacons is to attend to the pecuniary concerns of the churches, assist the minister in church labours, supply the communion-table, bear the elements to the communicants, and take the lead in social meetings when necessary.

Usages of the Denomination.—Government among the Freewill Baptists is not episcopal, but independent or residing in the churches. Each elects its own pastor, exercises discipline over its own members, and is not accountable to the Quarterly Meeting only as a church; that is, Quarterly Meetings cannot discipline church members, but churches only. Churches are organized, and ministers ordained, by a council from a Quarterly Meeting; and a minister, as such, is subject to the discipline of the Quarterly Meeting to which he belongs, and not to the church of which he is pastor. Believers are admitted as members of the church upon baptism or by letter, always by unanimous vote, but may be excluded by vote of two-thirds. Churches hold monthly conferences, and report once in three months to the Quarterly Meeting by letter and delegates. Though the New Testament is their book of discipline, they have usually written covenants. Some churches commune once in three months, others once in two months, others monthly. *Quarterly Meetings* are composed of several churches, varying in number according to circumstances. Their sessions are four times a year, continuing two and a half days. The members of a Quarterly Meeting are ministers and such brethren as the churches may select. In these associations, preachers are appointed to supply, in part, destitute churches, candidates for the ministry examined and licensed, councils appointed to attend to ordinations, &c. A Ministers' Conference is held in connexion with the Quarterly Meeting. *Yearly Meetings* are constituted of several Quarterly Meetings, associated in the same manner as churches are in the formation of a Quarterly Meeting. The Yearly Meetings do something at sustaining evangelists or itinerating ministers; transact the relative business of the Quarterly Meetings, and adopt other measures for the spread of the gospel. The *General Conference* is com-

posed of a delegation, most of which are ministers, from all the Yearly Meetings in the connexion. It is now held once in three years, its sessions continuing some nine or ten days. Its design is to promote unity, scriptural holiness, Bible doctrine, and discipline, throughout the whole denomination. The General Conference has no powers except such as are committed to the delegates by those bodies which appoint them. It proposes and recommends, but makes not laws for the connexion. It is its proper province to deliberate on all such points of doctrine and practice as may be referred to it by the Yearly Meetings, or proposed by its own members, and give such advice as they think the Scriptures warrant, and the welfare of the connexion requires. Also to recommend such measures as may promote God's glory and the denomination's interest; such as, Home and Foreign Missionary Societies, book concern, and printing establishment, seminaries of learning, and such other benevolent institutions as are necessary for the prosperity of the church.

III. PRESENT STATISTICS.

Numbers.—The Freewill Baptist denomination extends now into most of the United States, Upper and Lower Canada, and the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The present number of communicants, by calculation from what statistics are on hand, is something rising 54,000. Net increase for the last year, was 3471. Number of churches, according to last year's reports, is 1057. Whole number of ministers 898; ordained, 714; licensed, 184. Quarterly Meetings, 95. Yearly Meetings, 20.

Benevolent Institutions.—The "Freewill Baptist Foreign Mission Society," was organized some eight or ten years ago, and has now two stations in Orissa, three missionaries and wives, assisted by two native preachers, and a small church and a school at each station. Other missionaries are received by the society and will sail soon. "Freewill Baptist Home Mission Society," was organized near the same time, and has a larger number of missionaries in the field, most of them in the West. "Freewill Baptist Sabbath-school Union," keeps a depository of Sabbath-school books at Dover, N. H.; most of our churches have good Sabbath-schools. "Freewill Baptist Education Society," has for its leading objects the sustaining of the Biblical School, and the promoting of education in the ministry. "New York Education Society," aids the Clinton Seminary. "Western Reserve F. B. Education Society," aids chiefly the Freewill Baptist Western Reserve Seminary, in Ohio. There are also

other benevolent associations, particularly in the causes of temperance and anti-slavery.

Literary Institutions.—The Freewill Baptists have the following academies, most of which are in a very prosperous state: “Smithville Seminary,” located at North Scituate, Rhode Island; “Clinton Seminary,” at Clinton, New York; “Parsonsfield Seminary,” at Parsonsfield, Maine; “Strafford Academy,” at Strafford, New Hampshire; “Sheldon High School,” at Varysburgh, New York; “Freewill Baptist Western Reserve Seminary,” in the State of Ohio. They have a “Biblical School,” in Dracut, Massachusetts, which, though yet in its infancy, promises to be of great advantage to the Freewill Baptist ministry, and consequently to the denomination. The course of studies is for three years, though students are admitted for any shorter length of time. Students in attendance 25 to 30.

The *book concern* and *printing establishment* are at Dover, New Hampshire. Its trustees are appointed by General Conference. They have a power press and several others, and most of their books are printed here,—and their periodicals, some of which are, “Morning Star,” a weekly; “Freewill Baptist Magazine,” a quarterly; “Sabbath School Repository,” and “Freewill Baptist Missionary,” monthlies. REFERENCES—Life of Randall; Buzzell’s Magazine; Life of Colby; Freewill Baptist Treatise; D. Marks’ Narrative; Freewill Baptist Register; Star and Magazine.

HISTORY

OF

THE SEVENTH DAY BAPTISTS.

BY W. B. GILLET,

PASTOR OF THE SEVENTH DAY BAPTIST CHURCH, PISCATAWAY, N. J.

EVERY denomination is proud of tracing its origin back to its founder. But not so with the Seventh Day Baptists. They have no authentic records by which they can ascertain their origin, other than the New Testament. Neither would they pretend that they can trace their existence back through the dark ages to the Apostles; yet they are bold to say they can do it with as much, or with more certainty, than any denomination now in existence.

The sentiments to which they hold, and the principles that distinguish them from the religious world, they think, they are able to show, were taught by the Apostles, and practised by the early Christians. That the seventh day Sabbath, was observed by the Church, until the decree of Constantine, profane history abundantly shows; and very soon all the Roman dominions felt the effects of God's law being made void by human traditions.

Although the mystery of iniquity began to work before the Apostles left the stage, it had not shown itself supported by the secular arm, until, under the pretence of doing honour to Jesus Christ, God's law was set at naught, and human laws, unjust and cruel, enacted in its stead.

In Chambers's Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, he says, "In 321, the seventh day was observed in Rome, and the enacting of Constantine's laws, relative to the observation of the first day, shows, that it was not regarded as holy time."

Robinson in his History of Baptism says, "That there were forty-four Jewish Christian churches in Rome, which must have been in the latter part of the second century." What is required to constitute a Jewish Christian Church, in Mr. Robinson's opinion, is evident from what he says of the Council of Bishops, in 517. He calls them, "African Jewish Christians." The charge alleged against them is, that in

one of their canons they had done something towards regulating the keeping of the Sabbath. It is probable that those forty-four churches in Rome, were guilty of the same offence.

Mosheim gives an account of a sect in the twelfth century, in Lombardy, who were called *Passagenians*, or the circumcised; they circumcised their followers, and celebrated the Jewish Sabbath. The account of their practising circumcision is doubtless a slanderous story; and, because they observed the seventh day, they were called, by way of derision, Jews.

There were Seventh Day Baptists in Transylvania. *Francis Davidis*, first chaplain to the court of *Sigismund*, the prince of that kingdom, and afterwards superintendent of all the Transylvania churches, was a Seventh Day Baptist. (Bened's Hist. vol. ii. p. 414.)

As these Eastern churches have uniformly practised immersion for baptism, these extracts show that there have been Christian churches from the earliest ages of Christianity, who agree in sentiment with the Seventh Day Baptists in America.

But it is uncertain whether the English Seventh Day Baptists originated from these Eastern churches, or whether they were led to embrace their views from the Scriptures only; their views have ever been the same as those entertained by the earlier Christians, who have observed the seventh day of the week. At what time the Seventh Day Baptists first made their appearance in England, is uncertain. It is apparent that the Anglo-Saxons in their early settlement of Great Britain, were many of them Seventh Day Baptists. But the same tyranny that affected the Church at Rome, spread its baneful influence over the island of Great Britain.

Dr. Chambers says, "There was a sect arose in the sixteenth century but we have no particular account of their churches until about 1650." In 1668 there were nine or ten churches, besides many scattered disciples in different parts of the kingdom. About this time there was much debate upon the subject of the Sabbath, and the controversy became sharp; there were engaged in it, on both sides, men of learning and ability, and some of their works are still extant.

While they were permitted to enjoy their privileges peaceably, they prospered, notwithstanding the influence of the pulpit and the press, In 1668 Mr. Edward Stennett, a Seventh Day Baptist minister, and pastor of a church in England, writes to his friends in America, and says, the churches here have their liberty, but we hear that strong bonds are making for us. And it was this good man's lot to bear a part of the persecutions of that day. For the Conventicle Act forbid them to meet on the Sabbath for worship at any rate. If they met

on the Sabbath, they had to do it by stealth; whilst their enemies were ever watchful, to find, if possible, some accusation against them. Mr. Stennett was arrested under pretence that he held meetings in his house, which meetings he had held in his hall for a long time, but they were managed with so much discretion, that it was impossible for those inimical to them to be admitted, so as to appear as witnesses against the persons who met there. At length a neighbouring clergyman, resolved to suborn witnesses, but in this he was defeated. And he was a clergyman who had professed great friendship for Mr. Stennett. Mr. Stennett knowing that no proof of those charges by those witnesses, could be made justly, he resolved to traverse it. Various circumstances occurred that were all in his favour; so that when Mr. Stennett came to Newburg, neither prosecutor nor witness appearing against him, he was discharged. After this he was confined a long time in prison.

Many of the Seventh Day Baptist ministers were taken from their families and congregations, and were cast into prison. Among the number was Rev. Joseph Davis, who was a long time prisoner in Oxon Castle. Francis Bamfield was one of the most eminent ministers of his time. He was educated at Oxford, and was a number of years a minister of the established church. In the time of the civil wars he was against the Parliament, and opposed to the Protector's usurpation; he suffered much on that account. At what time he became a Baptist is not known, but on the restoration of Charles, he was treated with unrelenting severity. In one prison he was confined eight years. After that he was released, went to London, and gathered a church that still exists as a Seventh Day Baptist Church; after that he was again imprisoned, and there died in 1683.

Robert Spaulder and John Mauldin, were Seventh Day Baptists, and much persecuted; and Spaulder was even taken out of his grave by his persecutors. (Bene's Hist. vol. ii. p. 417.) But the most barbarous and cruel acts of persecution were practised upon John James, the minister of a Seventh Day Baptist Church in London; he was put to death in a most cruel manner in 1661. To take away his life was not enough to satisfy his enemies, but after being hung at Tyburn, he was drawn and quartered, his quarters were carried back to Newgate on the sledge that carried him to the gallows; they were afterwards placed on the gate of the city, and his head was placed on a pole, opposite his meeting house. He went to the gallows as an innocent man, and died in a joyful manner. This is a brief narrative of the prosperity, trials, and sufferings of the early Seventh Day Baptists in England. Some left the country, others still adhered to their peculiar views; even to the present day there are a few small

churches in England. There are two in London, one at Shoreditch, one at Mill Yard, but their numbers must be small; and there are some scattering individuals throughout the kingdom, and some in Scotland.

In 1665 Mr. Stephen Mumford, a Seventh Day Baptist, came from England to Newport, Rhode Island, and soon Mr. Samuel Hubbard, a Baptist, embraced his views; there were others who soon embraced the same sentiments, but they continued to travel together in the same church until 1671. Mr. Hubbard has left a manuscript journal, in which he gives an account of their separation. Soon after this (alluding to their embracing the Sabbath,) many hard things were said to the Sabbath-keepers by their brethren, that they had gone from Christ to Moses; that the gentiles had nothing to do with the ten commandments. And in 1681 they came to an open separation, when these brethren and sisters entered into church-fellowship together, and became the first Seventh Day Baptist Church in America. This little church being thus constituted, William Hiscox became their first pastor; but a hostile spirit was soon raised against this little band, and laws were enacted severe and criminal in their nature. John Rogers, a member of this church, was sentenced to sit a certain time upon a gallows with a rope about his neck, to which he submitted.

There were many other severities practised upon the Sabbath-keepers in New England, while the Baptists were persecuted for their baptism. The Seventh Day Baptists met with opposition from all, and as far as the civil laws would permit, they suffered the dire effects arising from this state of things.

From these and other causes the progress of the Seventh Day Baptists has been very much impeded. Their history details no remarkable revolution in their favour. Worldly honours, interest, influence and convenience are against them, and have always been opposed to their perseverance in the observance of the Sabbath. The members composing the church at Newport have felt the disadvantages attending them in a city, and for years they have been on the decline; since many have removed to different parts of the State, and some made their way into the far West, where they have been the means of establishing churches, some of which are large and flourishing. But this event has not terminated in extinguishing the little light; although the mother church has become very weak and almost extinct. This church has had a succession of worthy ministers, the most of them were born, ordained, and preached, and died, members of that church.

The church at Hopkinton, R. I., was established by brethren from Newport, in 1708. For a number of years this church numbered nine hundred members, but several churches have since been constituted in the vicinity, by members from this church. They still number over five hundred members, having two ordained ministers, and an elegant meeting-house on the banks of the Paucatuck river.

From this church there have been sent out many ministers, who have been lasting blessings to the cause of truth. There are now in Rhode Island seven churches, six ordained ministers, and not far from one thousand communicants; and from these churches the tide of emigration has taken hundreds into the western country.

In the State of Connecticut there are but two small churches, which probably number one hundred communicants, and but one ordained minister.

The Seventh Day Baptists in New Jersey arose from different circumstances. One Edmund Dunham, a First Day Baptist member, became convinced that he and his brethren were in an error as it regarded the Sabbath of the Lord. He presented his views to his brethren, and about twenty of his brethren and sisters came out with him in sentiment. They separated from the First Day church, and entered into covenant together, to walk together as a gospel church, in 1705, and sent Edmund Dunham to Rhode Island to receive ordination, and he was chosen their pastor.

They are located in the county of Middlesex, Piscataway township, thirty miles from New York city, and six miles from New Brunswick. As a church, they have been called in years past to pass through many severe trials, but God sustained them; yet for a few years past their history has been more favourable. They have now a neat and elegant house of worship, and a parsonage farm on which their pastor lives. At present they number 170 communicants.

The church at Plainfield was formed of members from this church in 1838. They have a beautiful house of worship in the village of Plainfield; numbering about 70 communicants,—at present without a pastor.

A few families removed from Piscataway to Cumberland county, forty miles below Philadelphia, at an early day, and a few families of Welsh extraction settled there from the State of Delaware. They were constituted into a church in 1737. Jonathan Davis was their first pastor. They are situated in a pleasant country, at the village of Shiloh, where they have an ancient brick meeting-house, adjoining to which is their graveyard, where a number of generations have

been deposited to wait until the resurrection morn. Among this multitude is a number of worthy ministers, who have finished their work and have gone to rest, and the place where they lie is marked to the stranger by the large marble monument, on which we read a brief history of their lives. The church now numbers 226 communicants.

The church in Salem County, New Jersey, was formed by members from the church at Shiloh, in 1811. Jacob Ayars, since deceased, was their pastor. They are well situated, but a few miles from Shiloh. They have a comfortable house of worship, and number near 100 communicants.

In the State of New Jersey there are four churches, four ordained ministers, and about 560 communicants.

There are a number of families in the city of New York of Seventh Day Baptists; they have not been constituted into a church, but they hold meetings Sabbath days at their own houses. The Seventh Day Baptists in the State of New York first moved from Rhode Island, and settled in different parts, so that at the present they are more numerous than in any other State. There is in this State as follows:

In Rensselaer County two churches—Berlin, 223 communicants; Petersburg, 142 communicants.

Madison County—Brookfield, three churches; first, 309 communicants; second, 143 communicants; third, 136 communicants; De Ruyter, 145 communicants.

Chenango County—Preston, 72 communicants; Otselic, 36 communicants.

Otsego County—Lincklean, 122 communicants.

Jefferson County—Adams, 218 communicants; Houndsfield, 44 communicants.

Lewis County—Watson, 45 communicants.

Oneida County—Verona, two churches; first, 113 communicants; second, 20 communicants.

Cortland County—Truxton, 78 communicants; Scott, 181 communicants.

Erie County—Clarence, 157 communicants.

Cattaraugus County—Persia, 86 communicants.

Allegany County—Alfred, two churches; first, 448 communicants; second, 165 communicants; Amity, 32 communicants; Scio, 35 communicants; Independence, 100 communicants; Friendship, 133 communicants; Bolivar, 58 communicants; Genesee, three churches;

first, 159 communicants; second, 47 communicants; third, 54 communicants.

In the State of New York are twenty-seven churches, three thousand four hundred and ninety-one communicants, nineteen ordained ministers, and a number of licentiates.

In the early settlement of this country there were five churches established in the vicinity of Philadelphia, but there were not more than thirty members in them all, but they have been long since extinct. In Fayette County, Pennsylvania, is a small church, not exceeding 20 communicants. In Potter County, Pennsylvania, there is a church numbering 41 communicants, but no minister. And in Crawford County, Pennsylvania, there is a church numbering 75 communicants. They have a meeting-house and pastor.

In Pennsylvania there are three churches, 136 communicants, and but one ordained minister.

The Seventh Day Baptists in the State of Virginia emigrated first from New Jersey, and constituted a church in Harrison County, at New Salem, 1745; they now number 58 communicants. Lost Creek, 61 communicants; South Forks Hughes River, Wood County, 20 communicants; North Forks Hughes River, 15 communicants. In Virginia there are four churches, two ordained ministers, and 154 communicants.

The Seventh Day Baptists in Ohio emigrated from Virginia and New Jersey, and settled in Clark County, Pike, and constituted a church in 1824; they number 30 communicants; Port Jefferson, 46 communicants; Sciota, 20 communicants; Jackson, 38 communicants; Stokes, — communicants. There are in Ohio five churches, three ordained ministers, probably 200 communicants, as there is a number of settlements where churches will soon be formed.

There are numerous settlements of Seventh Day Baptists in Illinois, although there is but one small church; there is also a small church in Iowa Territory. There is a number of settlements in Michigan, but no church. In Wisconsin Territory there is a church numbering near 100 communicants, and two ministers. Besides these, there are scattered families in every State, and in almost all our cities.

There are in the United States about fifty churches, forty ordained ministers, and about six thousand communicants. They are divided into four associations. The Eastern Association includes the churches in Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey. The Central Association includes the churches in the State of New York, east of the

small lakes. The Western Association includes the churches in the western part of New York and Pennsylvania. The Southwestern, the churches in Virginia, Ohio, and all west thereof. They have an annual conference that meets yearly. This conference is composed of delegates from the associations and churches, as some churches do not unite with the associations. As they are strictly congregational in their discipline, and every church is an independent body to transact its own business: all the business done at these meetings is to examine different subjects, and impart instruction to the churches by way of advice, there being no right to interfere with the independence of the churches. Every church holds its meetings of business, where all business is done by a vote from the body, all being equal in power, and no one having any more authority than another.

The officers of the churches are pastors and deacons. The business of the pastor is to instruct the people of his charge, and officiate faithfully in his station as a counsellor; and he should consider it his great business to preach the Word, to reprove the disobedient, to comfort the afflicted, and to feed the flock of Christ with the bread of life, and to administer to them the ordinances of God's house, (baptism and the Lord's Supper;) and it is considered the duty of the pastor to give himself wholly to the work of the ministry, as far as circumstances will admit, "*to the edifying of the body of Christ.*"

The deacons are chosen for life; it is their duty to assist the pastor in his labours, to see that his wants are supplied, and that all the internal affairs of the church are kept in proper order, as it relates to discipline and the temporal necessities of the same, and that the poor be not neglected. And, in a word, they are considered the leaders of the church, and ought always to be men full of the Holy Ghost.

Every church has a clerk, whose duty it is to keep a faithful record, in a book, of all the proceedings of the church, with a record of the names of the members, the time of their baptism, &c.

They have a weekly paper, published at De Ruyter, Madison County, New York, which is patronized by the denomination. It has at the present about twelve hundred subscribers, at two dollars per year, in advance. Rev. James Baily is editor and proprietor.

They have a Literary Institution, founded in 1837, at De Ruyter, held by stockholders. The cost was twenty-one thousand dollars. It has been labouring under some difficulties, and therefore has not come up to the first expectations; but a number of young men are now pursuing their studies there, who promise much usefulness to the world. They have two professors and some primary teachers, and the prospects of the institution are more encouraging.

They have an Academy at Alfred, Allegany County, New York, which is in a very flourishing condition, and has upwards of one hundred students. William Winyon, from Union College, is principal, and Miss Caroline Mason preceptress. This is a chartered institution, under the patronage of the State.

For some years they have had a Missionary Society, which holds its meetings annually, at the time of the meeting of the General Conference. Its object is to help feeble churches, and to send the gospel to the scattered families in different parts, where they are not privileged with the means of grace in a church capacity, and to preach the gospel to others as opportunity may present.

They likewise have a Hebrew Missionary Society, whose object is to ameliorate the condition of the Jews in the United States. They have had a missionary employed for that purpose in the cities of New York and Philadelphia, and some tracts were published, addressed to that people; but no visible effects have been produced. At present the society is doing nothing.

They have a Tract Society that is at present in operation, and has been doing something in publishing tracts on different subjects, especially upon our particular views.

As a denomination they wish to be engaged, as far as they possess the means, in the various benevolent enterprises of the day, and in these they have been found active.

CONFESSION OF FAITH.

The following was adopted as the general views of the denomination, by a vote of the General Conference, at its meeting in 1833.

I. We believe that there is one God; "For there is one God," 1 Tim. ii. 5; and that there is no other God, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6. We believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, Acts viii. 37; and that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, and of Jesus Christ, his Son. "If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you," Rom. viii. 9. "God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts," Gal. iv. 6. "Christ in you the hope of glory," Col. i. 27. "God dwelleth in us," 1 John iv. 6. From these texts, and many more of like import, we believe that there is a union existing between the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and that they are equally divine, and equally entitled to our adoration.

II. We believe that man was made upright and good, and had ability to have remained so, but that through temptation he was induced to violate the law of God, and thus fell from his uprightness,

and came under the curse of the law, and became a subject of death; and that all of his posterity have inherited from him depravity and death. "God made man upright," Eccl. vii. 29. "God created man in his own image," Gen. i. 27. "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." Gen. iii. 17-19. "Wherefore as by one man sin hath entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned." Rom. v. 12. "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God." Rom. viii. 7. "And ye will not come to me that ye might have life." 1 John v. 40. "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. vi. 9. "They did not like to retain God in their knowledge." Rom. i. 28. "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." Ps. xiv. 3. "And were by nature the children of wrath." Ephes. ii. 3.

III. We believe that God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. John iii. 16. That he took on him our nature, and was born of the Virgin Mary; that he offered himself a sacrifice for sin; that he suffered death upon the cross; was buried, and at the expiration of three days and three nights, rose from the dead; and that he ascended to the right hand of God, and is the mediator between God and man; from whence he will come to judge, and reward all men according to the deeds done in their bodies. "He took on him the seed of Abraham," Heb. ii. 16; and "being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. ii. 8. "But now, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. ix. 26. "The Son of Man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Matt. xii. 40. "He is risen as he said." Matt. xxviii. 6. "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat." Mark xvi. 19. "For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Rom. xvi. 19. "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts xvii. 31.

IV. We believe that by the humiliation and sufferings of Christ he made an atonement, and became the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; but that the nature or character of this atonement is

such as not to admit of justification without faith, or salvation without holiness. "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isaiah liii. 6. "And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world." 1 John ii. 2. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. ii. 9. "Who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. ii. 4. "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. v. 1. "Without faith it is impossible to please God." Heb. xi. 6. "Follow peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." Heb. xii. 14.

V. We believe that *regeneration* is essential to salvation, that it consists in a renovation of the heart, hatred to sin, and love to God; and that it produces reformation of life in whatever is known to be sinful; and a willing conformity to the authority and precepts of Christ. John iii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 17; Ephes. ii. 10; James ii. 17; 1 John v. 2.

VI. As to good works, we believe that they are not the ground of the believer's hope, but that they are fruits essential to a justified state, and necessary as evidence of a new birth. John xiv. 23.

VII. We believe that there will be a general resurrection of the bodies, both of the just and of the unjust. John xxviii. 29.

VIII. We believe there will be a day of judgment for both the righteous and the wicked, and that Jesus Christ shall judge and reward every man according to his works. Acts xvii. 31; Rev. xxii. 12.

IX. We believe that the righteous will be admitted into life eternal, and that the wicked shall receive eternal damnation. Matt. xxv. 46.

X. We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are given by inspiration of God, and that they contain the whole of God's revealed will, and are the only infallible rule to faith and duty. Isaiah viii. 20.

XI. We believe that the moral law, written upon tables of stone, and recorded in Exodus xx., to be morally and religiously binding upon the church. Matt. v. 17.

XII. We believe it is the duty of all men, and especially the church of God, to observe religiously the seventh day of the week, as commanded in the fourth precept of the decalogue, Exodus xx. 10. Mark ii. 27, 28; Luke xxiii. 5, 7.

XIII. We believe that a gospel church is composed of such persons, and such only, as have given satisfactory evidence of regeneration, and have submitted to gospel baptism. Acts ii. 41.

XIV. We believe that Christian baptism is the immersion in water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, of a believer in Christ, upon a profession of the gospel faith; and that no other water baptism is valid. Col. ii. 12; Rom. vi. 4; Ephes. iv. 5.

XV. Concerning imposition of hands, we believe it was the practice of the Apostles and the primitive church, to lay hands upon the newly baptized believers; and it should be perpetuated in the church. We therefore practise it. Acts viii. 17; xix. 6; Heb. vi. 2.

XVI. We believe it is the duty of all members of the church, to commemorate the sufferings of Christ, in partaking of the Lord's Supper, as often as the church shall deem it expedient and the circumstances admit. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27; 1 Cor. xi. 26.

XVII. As we deem it unscriptural to admit to the membership of the church any person who does not yield obedience to the commandments of God, and the institutions of the Gospel, or who would be a subject of church censure, were he a member of the church: so we deem it equally unscriptural and improper, to receive such at the Lord's table, or to partake with them of the Lord's Supper. 1 Cor. v. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 6.

THEIR VIEWS OF BAPTISM.

As a denomination they practise what is termed close communion. Their reasons for this are the following:

They consider that the Pedobaptist brethren have perverted the ordinance of baptism, by abandoning the original institution, which was dipping or immersion, and using that of sprinkling or pouring.

They do not charge them with a wilful violation of the divine rule, but with the matter of fact; while they extend to them charity, and believe them to be sincere.

On one term only does this great question rest; and that is, What is the original import of the Greek word "*Baptize*?" Baptists have and still contend, that the word originally implied immersion. Pedobaptists have contended that it implied merely a religious rite, and meaning many other things, such as *sprinkling*, *pouring*, *washing*, &c.

To these speculations they have only to apply their own antidote. The word *baptize* is Greek, and in the English language means just nothing at all, unless they are allowed to translate it. And whom shall

they call upon to do it? They will not take the translation of *Baptists*, for that may beget partiality; but they choose to take the evidence of men who spoke out before the art of prevarication was so extensively known among Protestants. For when they present Pedobaptist authors, who show the greatest marks of candour, they cannot be objected to. In view of these remarks, in connexion with the following quotations, they are willing at all times to submit them to a thinking community, as being the doctrine that is taught in the Holy Scriptures. And to strengthen their faith, they have the testimony of the whole Christian world in their favour.

LUTHER.—“The term baptize is a Greek word; it may be rendered immersion, as when we plunge something in water, that it may be entirely covered with water. And though that custom is now abolished among the generality, (for even children are not entirely immersed, but only have a little water poured on them,) nevertheless they ought to be completely immersed, and immediately drawn out, *for the etymology of the word evidently requires it.*”

CALVIN.—“The word baptize, signifies to immerse. The right of immersion was observed by the ancient church. From these quotations, and from John iii. 23, it may be inferred that baptism was administered by John, and Christ, by plunging the whole body under water. Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients, for they immersed the whole body under water; now it is a prevailing practice, for a minister only to sprinkle the body or the head.”

GROTIUS.—“That baptism used to be administered by immersion, and not pouring or sprinkling, appears both from the proper signification of the word, and the places chosen for the administration of the rite, John iii. 23; Acts viii. 28; and also from the many allusions of the apostles, which cannot be referred to sprinkling.” Rom. vi. 34; Col. ii. 12.

JOHN WESLEY.—“Mary Welsh, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church, and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion. The child was ill then, but recovered from that hour.”

Buried with him, “alluding to the ancient mode or manner of baptizing by immersion.”

To these testimonies, and scores that might be produced, of like import, they think that people of candour ought to give heed; and if they have given the true interpretation of the word, it is of itself evident, that those that sprinkle or pour do not baptize. These are their views, and according to the principles laid down they cannot extend

to others the communion, until they have complied with the gospel rule.

And they consider it to be perverted, in applying it to infants and impenitent individuals without profession of faith. No institution has "Thus saith the Lord," for applying it to infants, or the impenitent. A few testimonies from Pedobaptist authors may be introduced on this point.

BISHOP BURNET.—"There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for baptizing infants."

LUTHER.—"It cannot be proved by the Sacred Scriptures, that infant baptism was instituted by Christ or his disciples, or the early Christians after the Apostles."

CURCELLEUS.—"The baptism of infants in the two first centuries after Christ, was entirely unknown, but in the third and fourth, was allowed by some few. In the fifth and following ages it was generally received. The custom of baptizing infants did not begin before the third age after Christ was born. In the former ages no trace of it appears, and it was introduced without the command of Christ."

Thus they discover, that between the Baptists and the Pedobaptists there is no agreement in their views, and no agreement with the inspired word and Pedobaptism—at least so the Baptists think, and so they have a right to think, until they are better taught; and therefore as Baptists, they cannot in conscience extend to them the communion. And the Scriptures would condemn them for it, if they were to commune with those who practise such disorder, by departing from the tradition of the Apostles, and disobeying their epistles. Eph. xxxvi. 14. And the controversy existing between the Baptists and Pedobaptists, ought to be settled and put for ever to rest. This the Baptists cannot do, they cannot go to them, but the others can come to the Baptist standard, without any violation of conscience or faith. And may the time hasten its onward flight, when in the church there will be but "*one Lord, one faith, one baptism.*"

While this arm of Popery is attached to the Protestant church, they cannot with any expectation of success, contend with Catholicism, even in our own country. With much propriety they may say, *Physician, heal thyself*; this the church must learn, that the "*Bible alone is the religion of Protestants.*"

VIEWS OF THE SABBATH.

1. On this point of doctrine and practice, they differ from all other denominations. And this is the only essential point of difference be-

tween them and the large and respectable denomination, the Associate Baptists. By their belief and practice, as it respects the Sabbath, they are accounted singular; but they would wish at all times to have the privilege of rendering their reasons for doing thus, especially as by this they are known as close communicants. It may not be necessary here, to attempt to meet all the objections that are presented against their views, by men who have become wise above what is written. But it is intended merely to present their views and reasons for thus believing.

They believe that the Sabbath was instituted by God, and given to our first parents while in the garden of Eden; for in this institution was their happiness intimately concerned. As an evidence they refer to the ancients, and their customs. They had their days of observance. Noah observed the period of seven days in sending out the dove from the ark, in preference to any other number. The term week is used in the contract between Jacob and Laban. Balaam had seven altars, and offered seven oxen and seven rams upon them; likewise Job and his friends observed the term of seven days. All which (and others) go to prove that the ancients enjoyed the blessings of a Sabbath, and were not left destitute of this exalted favour, as some suppose, until the days of Moses. From Exodus xvi. we have a satisfactory evidence that the Israelites were not strangers to the Sabbath, long before they came to Mount Sinai, where the Law was given. For some of the people are voluntarily making preparations and provisions for the Sabbath, while others are reprimanded for neglecting it. And the very language shows that the Sabbath was not a new institution to them. "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and by-laws?" The very language of the fourth commandment itself implies that they had a previous knowledge of it: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." This injunction is not attached to any of the rest of the commandments, which evidently shows that they had not only been acquainted with it before, but that it was not of the least importance, as some vainly suppose. And its being mentioned in connexion with the creation of the world, shows to their satisfaction, that the inhabitants of the earth were not without a Sabbath two thousand and five hundred years. For the blessing and the sanctifying of the Sabbath is mentioned in connexion with the first seventh day in the order of time. And the reasons rendered are, that on it God rested from all his works. And the blessing and sanctifying the day were subsequent acts, which are given as a cause for its being set apart from other days as a Sabbath of holy rest unto the Lord.

And it is unreasonable to suppose that the cause existed two thousand and five hundred years before the effect. Jesus Christ says, Mark ii. 27, "That the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." Is it a good thing? were there any men of piety before Moses? And in the 34th Psalm we learn that "He will withhold no good thing from those who walk uprightly." The early history being so silent about the sabbath, is no evidence of its non-existence, for all the history of that age is given in forty short chapters. "We find, from time immemorial, the knowledge of weeks of seven days among all nations. Israelites, Egyptians, Indians, Arabians, and, in a word, all the nations of the East, have in all ages made use of weeks of seven days." "And we find, too, that the very day that God had sanctified as a sabbath, was regarded still as holy time, although they had forsaken the true worship of God." Among those authors we find the following: Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, Tibullus, Philo, Eusebius, Clemens Alexandrius, Josephus. It has been, and is supposed by some that the sabbath was made for the Jews only, hence it is called by them a Jewish sabbath; to this the Seventh Day Baptists object; although it is said, in Exodus, xxxi. 14, to be a sign between that people and God, but not between them and the Gentiles; but it has been and will be a sign between them and God to the end of time. And the words of our Saviour ought to put this question for ever to rest. Mark ii. 27, "The sabbath was made for man." It ought to be enough for us to know that God has instituted the sabbath, and required that it should be remembered and kept holy, especially when it is found among God's holy precepts, written with his own finger upon tables of stone, and we should not try to do away its force by our own traditions.

No reason ever has been given by any person why the law of the sabbath was inserted among those precepts which are universally allowed to be moral, unless it partakes of the same nature. As God is the God of the Gentiles, as well as of the Jews, so it is the duty of both Jews and Gentiles to love him and to keep his commandments, for they are a transfer of God's perfection; and the revelation of his will, as given upon Sinai, was and is the only moral rule that was ever given. So it is the duty of all men to come under it, as far as they receive a knowledge thereof, Isaiah lvi. 6, 7. They come therefore to the unavoidable conclusion that the sabbath was enjoined upon all mankind, as presented to us in the fourth commandment.

2. They are unwilling to admit that the sabbath was changed by divine appointment, or that it ever will be. If it was not a good sabbath why should it ever have been appointed? and if good, why

should it be altered? But if we can find a divine warrant for a change, we are ready to confess our wrongs and forsake them. St. Paul, in Heb. iv. 9, says that it is a type of the rest that remains for the people of God; this refers to the rest that remains for the saints in heaven, and types are always continued until the antitype comes to which they allude.

The sabbath law still remains in full force, and will until the end of time, unless God repeals it; and if so, the Scriptures will be as plain as when it was enjoined. It is a moral institution, (the reasons we have already assigned,) and of perpetual obligation, Psalm cxi. 7, 8, "All his commandments are sure, they stand fast for ever." Their perpetuity was typified by their being written upon tables of stone. If the sabbath was made for the benefit of man, no reason can be assigned for its discontinuance under the Christian dispensation. Erase a sabbath from the church and she would soon go to ruin; and it is ruin to people to believe and preach a doctrine, that would prove destruction if practised.

Let such ministers beware lest they be numbered with the slothful shepherds. The perpetuity of this law is asserted in Christ's sermon on the mount, (Matt. v.) and when he spoke these words, he knew that the ceremonial law would soon be destroyed by him, and nailed to the cross; therefore he must have alluded to the moral law. And in accordance with this he directs his disciples to pray "that their flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day." And this event was not to take place until about forty years after his crucifixion. Paul says, in Rom. iii. 31, "Do we make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea, we establish the law." Neither do we suppose that he meant to release us from this obligation, when he says, (ibid. xiv. 5, 6,) "One man esteemeth one day above another," &c., or, in Colossians, (ii. 16, 17,) "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect to a holy day, or of the new moon, or sabbath, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." The apostle is not speaking of the weekly sabbath, but of the Jewish ceremonial sabbath, which belongs to the ceremonial dispensation.

But the question may still be asked, What day of the week should we now keep holy? They at once say, the seventh, not *a* seventh, but the seventh day that God sanctified at Sinai, and rested on when he closed his work of creation, which was observed by Christ and his apostles, and the early Christians, until the dark ages of the church. We have no reason to believe that there has been any derangement in the order of time, so as to affect the observing the sabbath. That perfect agreement among all civilized nations, places it beyond all doubt;

and the church has always been known to keep either the first day or the seventh, ever since her establishment, and she has never existed without a sabbath. And the Jews, scattered among all nations, have never lost their sabbath. So that when they shall be gathered back to Judah's land, they will have the same identical sabbath, that God instituted in paradise, whether they go from this, or from other lands. But the advocates for a change of the sabbath are numerous and learned. Nevertheless, the Seventh Day Baptists cannot embrace their sentiments, for every man's sword is turned against his fellow; among them there is no agreement. They refer to prophecy, and the strongest is in Psalm cxviii. 24, "This is the day the Lord hath made, I will rejoice and be glad in it." If this alludes to any day, it must be the day that God has blessed, and not a new appointment. But we are satisfied with believing that this alludes to the gospel dispensation.

And Daniel and Isaiah, as well as Abraham and others, looked forward to that day with much interest and delight. And they are bold to say that the prophets are entirely silent as to a change of the sabbath. Another plea is, the work of redemption is greater than the work of creation, wherefore the sabbath should be changed. But they think they are not at liberty to limit God, and say which of his works is the greatest; they suppose that he can as easily make a world as an insect, and redeem man as easy as create him.

But the advocates for the change of the sabbath must fail according to their own logic; for it is the opinion of the church generally, though not universally, that Christ was crucified on Friday; if, then, any particular day can be called the day of redemption, it must be that on which he expired on the cross, and spilt his blood; "for without the shedding of blood there can be no remission." He died for our redemption, and the gracious work was doubtless done when he bowed his head and gave up the ghost and said, It is finished. But they do not admit that any personal act of his, "Who was made under the law," and bound to obey its precepts, could alter or change any of its requirements.

Another and general plea is, that Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week. Tradition says so, but the Bible does not. If it had been the mind of Christ that the day of his resurrection should have been religiously regarded: we would have some positive information as to the day on which he did rise; but not one passage is there to be found which says that he arose on the first day, or which enjoins its observance; but there is strong presumptive evidence that he did not rise on that day. This is found in his own predictions, Matt. xii. 40: he declares that he would be "three days and three nights in the heart

of the earth." Compare with Luke xxiii. 5, 4. If his prediction be true, he must have arisen at the close of the day previous to his appearing to the women, in the morning. And in Matt. xxviii. 1, we find that the great earthquake happened in the end of the sabbath. Mary was present, and an angel rolled back the stone and sat upon it, and told her that he was not here but was risen, referring her to his own predictions while with them.

Another reason rendered is, that Christ often met with his disciples upon the first day of the week. Supposing it was so, he met with them on other days; but that is no reason that they should be considered sabbath days. But probably they had better look again; people may have taken it for granted without evidence. The first day after his resurrection, he appeared three times to different persons, and at different places. First to the women at the tomb, next to the disciples on their way to Emmaus; he journeyed with them, and when they had arrived at the place of their destination, he was known of them by breaking bread and blessing it. The same hour they returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and while they were telling what things had happened, Jesus stood in the midst of them and said, Peace be unto you. Now in all this day's transaction, not a word is said about *sabbatizing*, but every evidence to the reverse; they were journeying, and Jesus journeyed with them, and from Jerusalem to Emmaus and back, is about fifteen miles. And it seems passing strange that he should not have told them that the day was holy to the Lord. And the disciples were assembled at their own lodging place, (Acts i. 13,) and had not met to celebrate the resurrection; for they did not believe that he had arisen, until confirmed by the disciples from Emmaus. And there is not the least intimation that the disciples were there until evening, or that they were there for worship. And the absence of Thomas is a strong presumption that the meeting was not agreed upon previously. The next and only meeting pretended to have been held by Christ and his disciples on the first day of the week, is mentioned in John, xx. 26 "And after eight days, &c."—But had this interview been on the following first day, it could not afford any claim for religious regard, for it is not noticed as a meeting designed for worship. Mark xvi. 14, says, "He appeared to the eleven while at meat," eating a common meal at their home doubtless. And it is a matter of certainty that this interview was not on the first day of the week, if the other one was; for eight days had intervened between them, where a week has but seven days. They say then without any fear of successful contradiction, that Christ has left us no example of his regard for the first day of the week as a sabbath.

As to the regard that the Apostles and early Christians paid to this day, all the Scriptures say about it, is contained in Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; the first relates to a meeting held in Troas, and Paul preached and broke bread to them. Now all this text proves is, that Paul held one meeting with these brethren on the first day of the week; but there is not the least intimation that it was their common custom to meet on the first day of the week, or that they should or did regard it as a sabbath. But this meeting was incidental, and held on account of the Apostles being about to leave the place. It was an evening meeting; and by Paul's speaking until midnight, and continuing until break of day, it was on the night part of the day; and if this meeting was held on any part of the first day of the week, it was between sun setting and first day morning, when Paul went on his way; and this is according to the Scripture mode of beginning the day, as it was literally the first day of the week after sunset.

The miracle wrought upon *Enticus*, in restoring him to life, is probably the only reason of this meeting being mentioned, while all the other meetings that Paul held while in Troas, were omitted; had this been on some other day of the week, there would not have been a single religious meeting held by the disciples on any part of a first day, recorded in the New Testament. We next notice 1 Cor. xvi. 2, "On the first day of the week let every one lay by him in store, &c." This text makes no mention of a meeting together, but to lay by them in store; this contribution was designed for the poor saints at Jerusalem; and they were requested to have it in readiness when Paul should come to receive it. Orders had been given to the church at Galatia concerning the same matter; but they say nothing concerning a first day meeting. But none of these or other passages give any reason to believe that the first day was ever designed by God to be a sabbath. Much has been said of the descent of the Holy Spirit (on the first day,) on the day of Pentecost. This they consider to be only a presumption, there being not the slightest evidence that the day of Pentecost was on the first day of the week, more than on any other day. But by the church generally, especially by ministers, the first day of the week is called Lord's Day, from Rev. i. 10; still there is no evidence that the first day of the week was alluded to in this expression. If it can be applied to any day, it would be much more appropriate to suppose that it referred to the sabbath day; for Jesus Christ says that he is "Lord even of the sabbath day." But it should not be supposed that John meant either of those days; but that he meant the same day styled in other parts of the Scriptures "The day of the Lord." And to this day John was carried in the spirit and

saw all things as they will take place, 1 Cor. i. 8; Phil. i. 6. And that this refers to his second coming, and not to any particular day of the week, must be placed beyond all doubt. These are some of their reasons for yet believing that the seventh day of the week is yet the sabbath of the Lord their God, and that by the church it should be observed as such.

But they suppose that Christ and his disciples paid special regard to the sabbath of the fourth commandment. It is always called by them "the sabbath" in distinction from any other day; if they had intended a change this would have been calculated to mislead and deceive. It was their custom to assemble for worship on the sabbath, and not on the first day of the week; for the next sabbath after his crucifixion they rested according to the commandment; and on the first day they were journeying, and went into the country. Acts xiii. Paul, while at Antioch on the sabbath day went to a place of worship; and we have the sketch of a sermon he preached on the occasion. And by the request of his gentile hearers he preached to them on the next sabbath, when nearly the whole city came together.

At Philippi Paul and his companions resorted down to the river side on the sabbath day, and Lydia and her household were baptized. Acts, xviii. Paul reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks; and this practice he continued a year and six months. At Ephesus, likewise, Paul went into the synagogue and reasoned with the Jews. And at Thessalonica there was a synagogue of the Jews; and Paul, as his manner was, went in with them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.

These quotations are sufficient to show what was the practice of the Apostles.

This is confirmed by Paul's going into the temple and performing certain rights of purification, for the purpose of refuting slanderous reports about his practising contrary to the law; and in Acts xx. 17, he states that he had committed nothing against the customs of the fathers. And was it not contrary to their custom, to keep the first day of the week to the exclusion of the seventh? If so, then it is evident that Paul kept the seventh and not the first day of the week, for the sabbath. The Jews, who were always ready to accuse them of wrong, never upbraided them with a violation of the *Sabbath*, which would have been the case, had there been an occasion. The opposition made to these sentiments, are supported by the feelings and circumstances of their opponents, and not by the word of God. But it may be necessary to refer to the practice of the early Christians.

ATHANASIUS, A. D. 340, "We assemble on Saturday, not that we are infected with Judaism, but only to worship Christ the Lord of the sabbath."

SOCRATES, A. D. 412, "Touching the Communion, there are sundry observations; for almost all the churches throughout the world do celebrate and receive the holy mysteries every sabbath. Yet the Egyptians adjoining Alexandria, together with the inhabitants of Thebes, of a tradition, do celebrate the Communion on Sunday, when the festival meeting throughout every week was come. I mean the Saturday, and the Sunday, upon which the Christians are wont to meet solemnly in the church," &c.

EUSEBIUS, A. D. 325, as quoted by Dr. Chambers, says that in his time the sabbath was observed no less than Sunday.

CALVIN. The old Fathers put in the place of the sabbath the day we call Sunday.

SOZOMEN has delivered down a tradition, that at Constantinople, and almost among all the churches, Christians did assemble on the sabbath, and also on the first day of the week; but at Rome and Alexandria not so.—Magdebur. 4th Cent. fol. 224.

PHELPS.—"Indeed so prevalent was this party (Sabbath-keepers) at one time, and so superstitious withal in their observance of the seventh day, that to counteract it the council of Laodicea, about A. D. 350, passed a decree saying, It is not proper for Christians to Judaize, and to cease from labour on the Sabbath, but they ought to work on this day, and put especial honour upon the Lord's day, by refraining from labour, as Christians. If any one be found Judaizing, let him be anathematized."—*Perpetuity Sab.* p. 151.

KINGSBURY.—Those who lived immediately after Christ did not misunderstand allusions to these different institutions. They all understood *Sabbath*, when used alone, to refer to the seventh day, or Jewish rest, and never the first day. Nor was it till after the disputes between the Jewish and Gentile converts had mainly subsided, and civil rulers (*Romans*) had required the observance of Lord's day, and *forbidden* the keeping of the seventh, that the term *Sabbath* was applied to the first day of the week. It was not until A. D. 603, that a papal decree was made *prohibiting* the observance of the *Sabbath*.—*The Sab.* p. 206.

With the light that the Bible reflects upon this subject, and from the practice of the early Christians, they are constrained to believe and practise as they do, notwithstanding the great body of the Christian world is arrayed against them; but they are assured that they have truth in their favour, and that it is mighty, and will ere long prevail.

BAPTISTS OR BRETHREN, GERMAN.

BY THE REV. PHILIP BOYLE,
UNIONTOWN, MARYLAND.

THE German Baptists, or Brethren, are a denomination of Christians who emigrated to this country from Germany between the years 1718 and 1730; they are commonly called Dunkers; but they have assumed for themselves the name of "Brethren," on account of what Christ said to his disciples, Matt. xxiii. 8, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all *ye are brethren*."

The following account of these people has been extracted from a work called "Materials toward a History of the American Baptists," published in 1770 by Morgan Edwards, then Fellow of Rhode Island College, and overseer of the Baptist Church in Philadelphia:

"Of the Germans in Pennsylvania who are commonly called Tunkers, to distinguish them from the Menonists; for both are styled *Die Täufer*, or Baptists. They are called Tunkers in derision, which is as much as '*sops*,' from *tunken*, to put a morsel in sauce; but as the term signifies *dippers*, they may rest content with their nickname. They are also called *Tumblers*, from the manner in which they perform baptism, which is by putting the person head forward under water (while kneeling), so as to resemble the motion of the body in the act of tumbling. The first appearance of these people in America was in the fall of the year 1719, when about twenty families landed in Philadelphia, and dispersed themselves, some to Germantown, some to Skippack, some to Oley, some to Conestoga, and elsewhere. This dispersion incapacitated them to meet in public worship, therefore they soon began to grow lukewarm in religion. But in the year 1722, Baker, Gomery, and Gantz, with the Trauzs, visited their scattered brethren, which was attended with a great revival, insomuch that societies were formed wherever a number of families were within reach one of another. But this lasted not above three years: they settled on their lees again; till about thirty families more of their persecuted brethren arrived in the fall of the year 1729, which both quickened them again and increased their number

every where. Those two companies had been members of one and the same church, which originated in Schwartzenu, in the year 1708, in Germany. The first constituents were Alexander Mack and wife, John Kipin and wife, George Grevy, Andreas Bhony, Lucas Fetter, and Joanna Nethigum. Being neighbours, they agreed together to read the Bible, and edify one another in the way they had been brought up, for as yet they did not know there were any Baptists in the world. However, believer's baptism and a congregational church soon gained on them, insomuch that they were determined to obey the gospel in those matters. These desired Alexander Mack to baptize them, but he deeming himself in reality unbaptized, refused; upon which they cast lots to find who should be administrator; on whom the lot fell hath been carefully concealed. However, baptized they were in the river Eder, by Schwartzenu, and then formed themselves into a church, choosing Alexander Mack as their minister. They increased fast, and began to spread their branches to Marienborn and Epstein, having John Naass and Christian Levy as their ministers in those places; but persecution quickly drove them thence: some to Holland, some to Crefelt. Soon after the mother church voluntarily removed from Schwartzenu to Serustervin, in Friesland, and from thence migrated toward America in 1719; and in 1729 those of Crefelt and Holland followed their brethren. Thus, we see, all the '*Tunker churches*' in America sprang from the church of Schwartzenu in Germany; that that church began in 1708, with only eight souls, and that in a place where no Baptist had been in the memory of man, nor any now are: in sixty-two years 'that little one is become a thousand, that small one a great nation.' It is very difficult to give a true account of the principles of these Tunkers, as they have not published any system or creed, except what two individuals have put forth, which has not been publicly avowed. However, I may assert the following things concerning them, from my own knowledge, viz., general redemption they certainly hold, and with all general salvation. They use great plainness of dress and language, like the Quakers, and like them will neither take an oath nor fight. They will not go to law, nor take interest for the money they lend.* They commonly wear their beards, and keep the first day (except one congregation).† They

* The taking of interest is now tolerated among them, but most of them do not demand or take full lawful interest, and some of them do not take any interest for the money they lend to their poorer brethren.

† It is quite probable the author here alludes to the (Sieben Taeger) Seventh Day Baptists, who formed a settlement at Ephrata, in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in the

celebrate the Lord's Supper, with its ancient attendants of love-feasts, washing feet, kiss of charity, and right hand of fellowship. They anoint the sick with oil for recovery; and use the trine immersion, with laying on of hands and prayer, even while the person baptized is in the water, which may easily be done, as the person kneels down to be baptized, and continues in that posture till both prayer and imposition of hands be performed. Their church government is the same with the English Baptists, except that every brother is allowed to stand up in the congregation, and speak by way of exhortation and expounding; and when by these means they find a man eminent for knowledge, and possessing aptness to teach, they choose him to be their minister, and ordain him with laying on of hands, attended with fasting and prayer, and giving the right hand of fellowship. They also have deacons, and aged women for deaconesses, who are allowed to use their gifts stately. They do not pay their ministers, unless it be by way of presents; neither do their ministers assert their right to pay, esteeming it 'more blessed to give than receive.' Their acquaintance with the Bible is admirable; in a word, they are meek and pious Christians, and have justly acquired the character of '*Harmless Tinkers.*'" The Rev. E. Winchester, one of the Baptist missionaries from England, in a work published by him in the year 1787, gave, among other things, the following account of these people: "They are industrious, sober, temperate, kind, charitable people; envying not the great, nor despising the mean. They read much, they sing and pray much; they are constant attendants upon the worship of God; their dwelling-houses are all houses of prayer: they walk in the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless, both in public and private. They 'bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' The law of kindness is in their mouths; no sourness or moroseness disgraces their religion: and whatsoever they believe their Saviour commands they practise, without inquiring or regarding what others do."

Though they in general maintain the same principles at this present time, yet they themselves confess there is not that same degree of vital piety existing among them that there was at the close of the eighteenth century; owing, as they think, to the circumstance of many of them having become very wealthy, and of their intermarriage with others.

The German Baptists, or *Brethren*, have now dispersed themselves

year 1724. These are the same people meant and described under the name Dunkards, in Buck's Theological Dictionary; there is no account given of the German Baptists or Brethren in that work.

almost through every State in the Union, more or less; but they are most numerous in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, and Indiana. It would be a difficult task to give a regular statistical account of these people, as they make it no part of their duty to keep an exact account of the number of communicants. Some of their larger congregations number from two to three hundred members; each congregation has from two to three preachers, and some more. In travelling and preaching there are in general two together; and very frequently one speaks in the German, and the other in the English language, to the same congregation. None of their ministers receive any pecuniary compensation for any services they perform pertaining to the ministry; they preach, officiate at marriages and funerals among all who call upon them, without respect to persons: though their ministers will not perform the rites of matrimony, unless they can be fully satisfied that there are no lawful objections in the case of either of the parties to be married.

Their teachers and deacons are all chosen by vote, and their bishops are chosen from among their teachers, after they have been fully tried and found faithful; they are ordained by the laying on of hands and by prayer, which is a very solemn and affecting ceremony. It is the duty of the bishops to travel from one congregation to another, not only to preach, but to set in order the things that may be wanting; to be present at their love-feasts and communions, and, when teachers and deacons are elected or chosen, or when a bishop is to be ordained, or when any member who holds an office in the church is to be excommunicated. As some of the congregations have no bishops, it is also the duty of the bishop in the adjoining congregation to assist in keeping an oversight of such congregations. An elder among them is, in general, the first or eldest chosen teacher in the congregation where there is no bishop; it is the duty of the elder to keep a constant oversight of that church by whom he is appointed as a teacher. It is his duty to appoint meetings, to baptize, to assist in excommunication, to solemnize the rites of matrimony, to travel occasionally to assist the bishops, and in certain cases to perform all the duties of a bishop. It is the duty of their teachers to exhort and preach at any of their regular stated meetings; and, by the request of a bishop or elder, to perform the ceremony of baptism and rites of matrimony.

It is the duty of their deacons, (or, as they are sometimes called, visiting brethren,) to keep a constant oversight of the poor widows and their children, to render them such assistance as may be necessary from time to time; it is also their duty to assist in making a general

visit among all the families or members in their respective congregations, at least once a year, in order to exhort and comfort one another, as well as to reconcile all offences that may occur from time to time. It is also their duty to read the Scriptures, to pray, and even exhort, if it may appear necessary, at their regular meetings of worship.

The general order of these people has been to hold their meetings for public worship at dwelling-houses; but in some of their congregations they have now erected meeting-houses, or places expressly for worship. Some of them are built very large, without a gallery or a pulpit.

They, as yet, have but one Annual Meeting, which is held every year about Whitsuntide, and is attended by the bishops and teachers, and other members, who may be sent as representatives from the various congregations. At these meetings there is, in general, a committee of five of the eldest bishops chosen from among those who are present, who retire to some convenient place, to hear and receive such cases as may then be brought before them, by the teachers and representatives from the various congregations, which are (or at least the most important of them) afterwards discussed and decided upon, and then those several queries with the considerations as then concluded, are recorded and printed in the German and English languages, and sent to the teachers in all the different congregations in the United States, who, when they receive them, or as soon as convenient, read them to the rest of their brethren. By this course of proceeding, they preserve a unity of sentiment and opinion throughout all their congregations.

Some of their ministers manifest a great deal of zeal in their Master's cause; and although some of them are poorly circumstanced in the world, yet they, at their own expense, leave their families for several weeks in succession, and some even longer, to preach the Gospel to others. They have had a general revival amongst them within the few last years past; many have been convicted and converted under their preaching, and the cause of religion seems to be progressing among them; and what might seem strange to some, is, that they baptize by immersion, and that at any season of the year.

In connexion with what has been said in the commencement of our account, concerning their doctrines, &c., we will only add, by way of conclusion, that they believe that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him; and that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should

not perish, but have everlasting life : and that God sent his Son into the world, to seek and to save that which was lost, believing that he is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God through a crucified Redeemer, who tasted death for every man, and was manifested to destroy the works of the devil. And although it has herein been testified, that they hold general redemption as a doctrine, still it is not preached among them in general, as an article of faith. It has probably been held forth by those who felt themselves, as it were, lost in the love of God ; and, perhaps, on this account, they have been charged with holding the sentiments of the Universalists, which they all deny. They conceive it their duty to declare the whole counsel of God, and therefore they feel themselves bound to proclaim his threatenings and his judgments against the wicked and ungodly ; yet in accordance with their general principles, which are *Love* and *Good Will*, they are more frequently led to speak of the love and goodness of God towards the children of men.

BAPTISTS, SEVENTH DAY, GERMAN.

BY WILLIAM M. FAHNESTOCK, M. D.,

BORDENTOWN, N. J.

ABOUT the year 1694, a controversy arose in the Protestant churches of Germany and Holland, in which vigorous attempts were made to reform some of the errors of the church, and with the design of promoting a more practical, vital religion. This party, at the head of which was the pious Spener, ecclesiastical superintendent of the court of Saxony, was opposed, violently, and after having bestowed upon them, in ridicule, the epithet of Pietists, they were suppressed in their public ministrations and lectures, by the Consistory of Wittemberg. Notwithstanding they were prohibited from promulgating, publicly, their views and principles, it led to inquiry among the people. This state of things continuing, many learned men of different universities left Europe and emigrated to America, whilst others remained and persevered in the prosecution of the work they had commenced with so much diligence. In the year 1708, Alexander Mack, of Schriesheim, and seven others in Schwartzenu, Germany, met together, regularly, to examine carefully and impartially, the doctrines of the New Testament, and to ascertain what are the obligations it imposes on professing Christians; determining to lay aside all preconceived opinions and traditional observances. The result of their inquiries terminated in the formation of the society now called the Dunkers, or First Day German Baptists. Meeting with much persecution as they grew into some importance, as all did who had independence enough to differ from the popular church, some were driven into Holland, some to Crefeld in the Duchy of Cleves, and the mother church voluntarily removed to Serustervin, in Friesland; and from thence emigrated to America in 1719, and dispersed to different parts of Pennsylvania, to Germantown, Skippack, Oley, Conestoga, and elsewhere. They formed a church at Germantown in 1723, under the charge of Peter Becker. The church grew rapidly in this country, receiving members from the banks of the Wissahiccon and from Lancaster county, and soon after a church was established

at Muehlbach, (Mill creek,) in that county. Of this community was one Conrad Beissel, a native of Germany. He had been a Presbyterian, and fled from the persecutions of that period. Wholly intent upon seeking out the true obligations of the word of God, and the proper observance of the rites and ceremonies it imposes, stripped of human authority, he conceived that there was an error among the Dunkers, in the observance of the day for the sabbath—that the seventh day was the command of the Lord God, and that day being established and sanctified, by the Great Jehovah, for ever, and no change, nor authority for change ever having been announced to man, by any power sufficient to set aside the solemn decree of the Almighty—a decree which he declared that he had sanctified for ever,—he felt it to be his duty to contend for the observance of that day. About the year 1725, he published a tract entering into a discussion of this point, which created some excitement and disturbance in the Society at Mill Creek; upon which he retired from the settlement, and went secretly to a cell on the banks of the Cocalico, (in the same county,) which had previously been occupied by one Elimelich, a hermit. His place of retirement was unknown for a long time to the people he had left, and when discovered, many of the Society at Mill Creek, who had become convinced of the truth of his proposition for the observance of the sabbath, settled around him in solitary cottages. They adopted the original sabbath—the seventh day—for public worship, in the year 1728; which has ever since been observed by their descendants, even unto the present day.

In the year 1732, the solitary life was changed into a conventicle one, and a Monastic Society was established as soon as the first buildings erected for the purpose were finished—May, 1733,—constituting, with the buildings subsequently erected by the community, the irregular, enclosed village of Ephrata. The habit of the Capuchins, or White Friars, was adopted by both the brethren and sisters; which consisted of a shirt, trowsers, and vest, with a long white gown and cowl, of woollen web in winter, and linen in summer. That of the sisters differed only in the substitution of petticoats for trowsers, and some little peculiarity in the shape of the cowl. Monastic names were given to all who entered the cloister. Onesimus (Israel Eckerlin) was constituted Prior, who was succeeded by Jæbez, (Peter Miller,) and the title of Father—spiritual father—was bestowed by the Society, upon Beissel, whose monastic name was Friedensam; to which the brethren afterwards added Gottrecht—implying, together, Peaceable God-right. In the year 1740, there were thirty-six single brethren in the cloister, and thirty-five sisters; and at one time, the

Society, including the members living in the neighbourhood, numbered nearly three hundred.

The community was a republic, in which all stood upon perfect equality and freedom. No monastic vows were taken, neither had they any written covenant, as is common in the Baptist churches. The New Testament was their confession of faith, their code of laws, and their church discipline. The property which belonged to the Society, by donation, and the labour of the single brethren and sisters, was common stock; but none were obliged to throw in their own property, or give up any of their possessions. The Society was supported by the income of the farm, grist mill, paper mill, oil mill, fulling mill, and the labour of the brethren and sisters in the cloister.

The principles of the Seventh Day Baptist Society of Ephrata, but little understood, generally, and much misrepresented abroad, may be summed up in a few words, viz.:

1. They receive the Bible as the only rule of faith, covenant, and code of laws for church government. They do not admit the least license with the letter and spirit of the Scriptures, and especially the New Testament—do not allow one jot or tittle to be added or rejected in the administration of the ordinances, but practise them precisely as they are instituted and made an example by Jesus Christ in his word.

2. They believe in the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the trinity of the Godhead; having unfurled this distinctive banner on the first page of a hymn book which they had printed for the Society as early as 1739, viz.: “There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.”

3. They believe that salvation is of grace, and not of works; and they rely solely on the merits and atonement of Christ. They believe, also, that that atonement is sufficient for every creature—that Christ died for all who will call upon his name, and offer fruits meet for repentance; and that all who come unto Christ are drawn of the Father.

4. They contend for the observance of the original Sabbath, believing that it requires an authority equal to the Great Institutor to change any of his decrees. They maintain that, as he blessed and sanctified that day for ever, which has never been abrogated in his word, nor any Scripture to be found to warrant that construction, it is still as binding as it was when it was reiterated amid the thunders of Mount Sinai. To alter so positive and hallowed a com-

mandment of the Almighty, they consider would require an explicit edict from the Great Jehovah. It was not foretold by any of the prophets, that with the new dispensation there would be any change in the sabbath, or any of the commandments. Christ, who declared himself the Lord of the Sabbath, observed the seventh day, and made it the day of his especial ministrations; nor did he authorize any change. The Apostles have not assumed to do away the original sabbath, or give any command to substitute the first for the seventh day. The circumstance of the disciples meeting together to break bread on the first day, which is sometimes used as a pretext for observing that day, is simply what the seventh day people do at this day. The sacrament was not administered by Christ nor by the Apostles on the sabbath, but on the first day, counting as the people of Ephrata still do, the evening and the morning to make the day.

5. They hold to the apostolic baptism—believers' baptism—and administer trine immersion, with the laying on of hands and prayer, while the recipient yet remains kneeling in the water.

6. They celebrate the Lord's Supper at night, in imitation of our Saviour;—washing at the same time each other's feet, agreeably to his command and example, as is expressly stated in the 13th chapter of the Evangelist John, 14th and 15th verses. This is attended to on the evening after the close of the sabbath—the sabbath terminating at sunset of the seventh day; thus making the supper an imitation of that instituted by Christ, and resembling also the meeting of the Apostles on the first day to break bread, which has produced much confusion in some minds in regard to the proper day to be observed.

Celibacy they consider a virtue, but never require it, nor do they take any vows in reference to it. They never prohibited marriage and lawful intercourse, between the sexes, as is stated by some writers, but when two concluded to be joined in wedlock, they were aided by the Society. It (celibacy) was urged as being more conducive to a holy life, for Paul saith: "They that are after the flesh, do mind the things of the flesh: but they that are after the spirit, the things of the spirit." And again: "He that is unmarried, careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife. There is this difference between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried women careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy, both in body and in spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband;—I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I." And they also consider that those who sacrifice

the lusts of the flesh, and live pure virgins, for Christ's sake, will be better fitted to, and will enjoy the first places in glory. St. John, in the Revelation, says: "I looked up, and lo, a Lamb stood on Mount Zion, and with him an hundred and forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps: and they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth. These are they that are not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the first fruits unto God and unto the Lamb." This was a fond, cherished subject, and was constantly inculcated. It may be considered the ground of the institution at Ephrata, whose prosperity and advancement was dependent on it being properly appreciated. It was sedulously kept before them, by their ministers, in its brightest colours; and all the Scripture, which was not a little, was brought to bear upon it, to inspire them with perseverance and faithfulness. It promised capabilities which others could not possess in the divine life, and also held out the brighter rewards of heaven. It was a prolific subject for many of their hymns, which seemed to hallow and sanctify virginity. I have seen one, an occasional hymn, for they multiplied new hymns for every particular meeting or celebration—one of which is very beautiful indeed, and which was a prophecy respecting Ephrata—a prophecy which has been verified. It invokes steadfastness of purpose among the brethren and sisters of the Cloister, and laments the downfall, in prospect of any declension, in most affecting strains. The following is a stanza from the hymn above alluded to:

Auch Ephrata, wird hier so lange stehen,
 Als Jungfrauen darinn am Reichen gehen;
 Wann aber dieser Adel wird aufhören,
 So wird die Rache diesen Ort zerstören.

They do not approve of paying their ministers a salary. They think the gospel was sent without money and without price, and that every one called to preach the word, should do it from the love of the cause, and in this matter to follow the advice and example of Paul. However, they never had any scruples in affording their ministers such supplies of life as they possess themselves, and they gave them the same support the other brethren enjoyed. Individual members may

give, as presents, what to them seemeth fit, in money, goods, &c.; and whenever the minister travels for religious purposes, if needy, he is supplied with money out of the treasury to bear his expenses.

These are the great and leading tenets and principles of the German Seventh Day Baptists of Pennsylvania. There are many other minor points of not sufficient importance to enumerate in detail, which may better be adverted to in replying to some errors which writers have saddled upon them, and which cannot, properly, be considered as tenets and principles, but only as peculiarities. I cannot, here, go into an exposition of the peculiar views of this people, nor enter into the minutia of the manner of performing all the ceremonies and ordinances. I would merely remark in regard to their regular worship, that they commence with a hymn, then prayers, (kneeling,) and after a second hymn, the minister requests one of the brethren (any one) to read a chapter out of the Scriptures, which they are at liberty to choose from any part of the Bible,—he then expounds the chapter; tracing its bearings and historical connexion with the prophets and the New Testament; after which the Exhorters enforce the duties it inculcates, and should any member, brother or single sister be able to improve the subject still farther, or have any remarks relative to the topic to make, is at perfect freedom to express them. Prayer and singing, with the reading of a psalm, instead of a benediction, conclude the service. At another time, and in another place, I may enter into a full exposition of the principles and ordinances of this Society, and exhibit at length their doctrines, and the grounds on which they are predicated.

This Society has been much misrepresented by writers who know but little of them, and mostly draw on their imaginations and the libels of the persecutors of the Society, for the principles of this people. In a short notice of Ephrata in Gordon's Gazetteer of Pennsylvania, drawn from an account published by one not very friendly to the Society, in the Transactions of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, several errors were inadvertently and unconsciously promulgated by the respected author. The good and devout Founder is represented as a crafty, designing usurper of ecclesiastical authority, and as assuming titles, honours, and power. This is not the place to enter into a full refutation of these charges, which are without foundation, and could only have originated in gross ignorance, or shameful wickedness. Beissel, who had been educated in the Calvinistic faith, left Europe that he might enjoy freedom of opinion in America; he withdrew from the Society of Dunkers at Mill Creek, because his views on the sabbath produced some dissension; and after he was

drawn from his seclusion by love for those who came and settled around him, and entreated his ministry, he devoted his whole life and property to advance the welfare of the Society; giving the management of the secular affairs entirely into the hands of others, while he gave his attention wholly to instructing them in the Word of Life, and establishing the gospel in its truth and simplicity. The title of "Father," and "Gottrecht," were conferred upon him by his brethren, and was not a presumptuous assumption of Beissel. Their principles are equally misrepresented in that as well as most other English accounts of the Society. In Buck's Theological Dictionary we are told, that "the principal tenets appear to be these: that future happiness is only attained by penance and outward mortification in this life; and that Jesus Christ, by his meritorious sufferings became the Redeemer of mankind in general, so each individual of the human race, by a life of abstinence and restraint, may work out his own salvation. Nay they go so far as to admit of works of supererogation, and declare that a man may do much more than he is in justice or equity obliged to do, and that his superabundant works may therefore be applied to the salvation of others;" and a great many other things equally ridiculous and unfounded. The account in that book is a tissue of misrepresentation, unworthy a place in a work of that character.

It is not one of their customs to wear long beards, as is frequently said of them; this is more the case with the Dunkers and Menonists. They are often represented as living on vegetables, the rules of the Society forbidding meats, for the purpose of mortifying the natural appetite, and also as lying on wooden benches, with billets of wood for pillows, as an act of penance. The true reason and explanation of this matter is, that both were done from considerations of economy. Their circumstances were very restricted, and their undertaking great. They studied the strictest simplicity and economy in all their arrangements: wooden flagons, wooden goblets, turned wooden trays, were used in administering the communion; and the same goblets are still in use, though they have been presented with more costly ones. Even the plates, off which they ate, were octangular pieces of thin poplar boards, their forks and candlesticks were of wood, and also every other article that could be made of that material, was used by the whole community. After they were relieved from the pressure of their expensive enterprise in providing such extensive accommodations, they enjoyed the cot for repose, and many others of the good things of life; though temperance in eating and drinking was scrupulously regarded. And it may be well to remark, there were not

any ardent spirits used in building the whole village, the timber of which was hewn, and all the boards sawed by hand during the winter months. The Society was a social community, and not a cold, repulsive, bigoted compact; though it has been sometimes represented as reserved and distant, and even not giving an answer when addressed on the road. Morgan Edwards, in his "Materials towards a History of the American Baptists," (published in 1770,) bears a different testimony: he says: "From the uncouth dress, the recluse and ascetic life of these people, sour aspects and rough manners might be expected; but on the contrary, a smiling innocence and meekness grace their countenances, and a softness of tone and accent adorn their conversation, and make their deportment gentle and obliging. Their singing is charming; partly owing to the pleasantness of their voices, the variety of parts they carry on together, and the devout manner of performance." And of Beissel, he gives the following character, which he says he had from one who knew him well. "He was very strict in his morals, and practised self-denial to an uncommon degree. Enthusiastic and whimsical he certainly was; but an apparent devoutness and sincerity ran through all his oddities. He was not an adept in any of the liberal arts and sciences except music, in which he excelled. He composed and set to music (in two, four, five, and seven parts) a volume of hymns, another of anthems. He published a dissertation on the fall of man, in the mysterious strain; also a volume of letters. He left behind him several books in manuscript, curiously written and embellished." One writer has made a remark, as invidious as it is unfounded, on the sisterhood, in stating that, "the sisters, it would seem, took little delight in their state of single blessedness, and two only (aged and ill-favoured ones we may suppose) continued steadfast in renunciation of marriages." They never had to renounce matrimony on entering the convent; and but four or five of the whole number that have been in the cloister, in the period of one hundred and ten years, left and were married. One of these married a gentleman in the city of Philadelphia, and afterwards much regretted her change, as did all others who left the "stille einsamkeit." The rest continued steadfast in that state of single blessedness, and now, save those remaining in the convent, lie beside each other in the beautiful cemetery in the fore-ground of the village.

These little things would not be considered worthy of any notice, but from fresh currency which has been given to them by a late popular work, which is extensively circulated throughout the state. We conclude our notice of the gratuitous aspersions, by a few words in reply to the charge of their denying the doctrine of original sin,

and the eternity of punishment. They do not hold that Adam's fall condemns indiscriminately all born souls, for many are born and die without sinning; but they admit and teach, that in the fall of Adam all disposition to good and holiness was lost, and that the whole race inherit a natural innate depravity, which will lead them to sin, and prove their sure condemnation, unless they repent, and are born again of the Holy Spirit. Beissel wrote a book on this subject, which is as curious as it is ingenious. He enters into long disquisitions on the nature of Adam and his capabilities, before the fall; explaining many things of the fall, and with it elucidating several parts of the Scriptures, which have, and would easily escape the attention of men of less profundity of genius. His views are somewhat mysterious, yet deep and ingenious, but in the present day would be deemed little more than refined speculations, sublimated into visions. But none go to deny the depravity of the human heart, and the sad consequences which the fall of Adam has entailed on every succeeding generation, unless each creature be regenerated and born again through the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit. They do not believe in the universal salvation in the usual acceptation of the term—they teach the sure reward of submission and obedience to the requisitions of the Lord, through the mercy of God in Christ Jesus; and believe fully in the punishment of transgression, for "the wages of sin is death," death to the joys of heaven, and an exclusion from the presence of the Lord; "Cast into utter darkness, where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, where the fire is never quenched, where the worm never dieth." The idea of a universal restoration did exist among some in the early days, and is to be attributed to attempts to explain the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and the twentieth chapter of the Revelations, and reconcile some other parts of the Scriptures. It, however, is never taught as a doctrine, but is always approached with the greatest caution and delicacy, by their pastor in private conversations with the members, who desire to be instructed upon this subject; and who invariably admonishes them to be diligent in making their calling and election sure; to be prepared for the first resurrection and not to depend on a second.

Though they considered contention with arms and at law unchristian and unbecoming professors, yet they were decided Whigs in the Revolution, and have, unfortunately, had to defend themselves too frequently in courts of justice. To set an example of forbearance and Christian meekness they suffered for a long time to be wronged and plundered, until forbearance was no longer a virtue. In the

French war (the war of 1756), the doors of the cloister, including the chapels, meeting-room, and every other building, were opened as a refuge for the inhabitants of Tulpehocken and Paxton settlements, then the frontiers, from the incursions of the hostile Indians, all of whom were received and kept by the Society during the period of alarm and danger:—upon hearing of which, a company of infantry was despatched by the royal government from Philadelphia to protect Ephrata; and on representation of the character of the Society, by the commissioners who were sent to visit the place, the government made them a present of a pair of very large glass communion goblets, which was the only recompense they would receive. At an earlier period they attracted the attention of the Penn family, and one of the young ladies, in England, commenced a correspondence with the Society.* Governor Penn visited them frequently, and desirous of giving them a solid evidence of his regard, had a tract of five thousand acres of land surrounding Ephrata surveyed and conveyed to them, as the Seventh Day Baptist Manor; but they refused to accept it, believing that large possessions were calculated to engender strife, and as more becoming to Christian pilgrims and sojourners not to be absorbed in the gains of this world and the accumulation of property. After the battle of Brandywine the whole establishment was opened to receive the wounded Americans, great numbers of whom were brought there in wagons, a distance of more than forty miles; and one hundred and fifty of whom died, and are buried on Mount Zion. Their doors were ever open to the weary traveller, and all visitors were cordially received and entertained, while they tarried, as is done in the *hospices* of Europe. They gave all the necessary supplies to the needy, even their own beds, and to stripping their own backs to afford some shelter from the “peltings of the pitiless storm,” to those who were exposed to the weather in inclement seasons.

Many of the brethren being men of education, they established, at a very early period, a school, which soon gained for itself an honourable reputation, many young men from Philadelphia and Baltimore being sent here to be educated. A sabbath school was also instituted for religious instruction, which flourished many years, and was attended with some remarkable consequences. It produced an anxious inquiry among the juvenile population who attended the school, which increased and grew into what is now termed a revival of religion. The scholars of the sabbath school met together every

* One letter from Lady Juliana Penn may be found in the *Memoirs of Daniel Rittenhouse*, LL. D., F. R. S.

day before and after common school hours, to pray and exhort one another, under the superintendence of one of the brethren. The excitement run into excess, and betrayed a zeal not according to knowledge; which induced Friedsam to discourage an enterprise, which had been commenced, and was partly under way, namely, erect a house for their especial use, to be called Succoth. Ludwig Hœcker, or Brother Obed as he was designated, who was the teacher of the common school, projected the plan of holding a school in the afternoons of the sabbath, and who, in connexion with some of the other brethren, commenced it, to give instruction to the indigent children who were kept from regular school by employments which their necessities obliged them to be engaged at during the week, as well as to give religious instruction to those of better circumstances. It is not known in what year exactly that the sabbath school was commenced. Hœcker came to Ephrata in the year 1739, and it is presumed that he began, soon after he took up his residence amongst the brethren. The materials for the building were furnished, as is recorded in the minutes of the Society, in the year 1749. After the battle of Brandywine, the sabbath school room, with others, was given up for a hospital, which was occupied as such some time; and the school was never afterwards resumed. Hœcker at that period was sixty years of age.

To Robert Raikes is certainly due the honour of having projected and successfully introduced the present general system of Sunday school instruction, but there is much credit justly due to the Seventh Day Baptists of Ephrata, for having established and maintained in operation, for a period of upwards of thirty years, a sabbath school, forty years before the first school was opened by the Gloucester philanthropist.

By this time (1777) the Society began to decline, but not from causes alleged by some writers—want of vigour of mind in the successor of Beissel, who died 1768; for his successor, Peter Miller, was a man of much greater powers of mind, and had the management of the establishment during Beissel's time; and to his energy and perseverance is mainly attributable the great prosperity of the institution in its early days. The institution was one of the seventeenth century, and in accordance with European feelings, most of the members being natives of Germany. The state of public opinion at Beissel's death was widely different from what it was during the first fifty years after Ephrata was established, in relation to politics and government, and with this march of intellect, different sentiments were entertained in regard to religious institutions. It was commenced as a social com-

munity in the midst of a wilderness—the hand of improvement made the desert bloom as the rose,—and at that time (1768) was not surrounded by a dense, promiscuous population. These circumstances connected with incessant persecution, the turmoil and contention into which they were thrown and constantly kept by some of their envious neighbours, were the principal causes of the decline of the Society.

There is still a small band who retain the principles, and meet together regularly to worship, on the evening and the morning of the Sabbath; but they are a flock without a shepherd—they have the forms but not the spirit, nor the zeal of their predecessors. The ancient community has been called “zealots.” Zeal is, certainly, better than indifference, and enthusiasm better than deadness. Zeal is the life of Christianity, and it is an honour to the denomination to be designated by a title, even if it be in ridicule, which imports their activity and faithfulness. The people of Ephrata now lack that desirable quality for which those of old are stigmatized; for that zeal would be an honour to them should they merit it. Ephrata would be a paradise as it was in former days, were the people now here such zealots, as those they have descended from. They now partake more of the cold Christianity of the world. It must not, however, be supposed that they were ranters, or made a noise and display in their zeal. It was a quiet, all-absorbing zeal, in which the world and all its vanities were sacrificed to pure and constant devotion: they were living and moving in this world, performing diligently all the duties that devolved upon them here; but their spirits, and all their conversation, were centered in heaven. Of them, who were derided with the epithet of “zealots,” Mr. Winchester, speaking of the people of Ephrata, in his dialogues, says: “I remember the Rev. Morgan Edwards, formerly minister of the Baptist church in Philadelphia, once said to me: ‘God will always have a visible people on earth, and these (the society at Ephrata) are his people at present, above any other in the world.’” Mr. Winchester says further, “They walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless, both in public and in private. They bring up their children, (now speaking of the married members,) in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; no noise, rudeness, shameless mirth, loud laughter, is heard within their doors. The law of kindness is in their mouths; no sourness or moroseness disgraces their religion, and whatsoever they believe their Saviour commands they practise, without inquiring, or regarding what others do. They read much; they sing and pray much; they are constant attendants upon the worship of God; their dwelling houses are all houses of prayer.” But alas! alas! it is not so now.

Ephrata has fallen—degenerated beyond all conception. It is now spiritually dead. Ichabod is written upon the walls of this branch of our Zion.

As early as 1758, there was a branch of this Society established at the Bermudian Creek, in York county, about fifteen miles from the town of York; some of the members of which still remain, though they have been without preaching many years. Another was established in 1763, in Bedford county, which still flourishes, and many members of the present Society are scattered through the counties of the interior of the State; so that the truth which was left has not become extinct, but is still extending, which is particularly the case at Snowhill; and hope is still entertained, that the little one may become a thousand, and the small one a great nation.

For a further detail of the history of this Society, a description of the Monastic Institution at Ephrata, and an account of their extensive literary labours and numerous publications, as well as their music, which is peculiar to themselves, see the writer's "Historical Sketch," in Hazard's Register of Pennsylvania, vol. xv. page 161; from which the foregoing article is extracted, and which will appear entire in the History of Lancaster County, now in preparation by the editor of this work, Mr. J. D. Rupp.

Out* of the foregoing church another branch was established in Franklin county, at a place now called Snowhill, and similar to the mother church at Ephrata, under the superintendence and eldership of Peter Lehman and Andrew Snowberger, where the greatest body of the Society now reside. Several small branches have since been established in western Pennsylvania.

In regard to their religious tenets, they believe in one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And also believe, "That all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." And consequently they acknowledge the Holy Scriptures as their only rule of faith and practice.

They keep the seventh day of the week for the Sabbath, in honour of God's command, and contend that no other day has ever been instituted as the sabbath, and that the one instituted in Paradise has never been abolished, by God himself, or by Jesus Christ, who acknowledgeth himself Lord of the Sabbath; and consequently is yet binding upon all mankind, as firmly and absolutely as upon the ancient Israelites.

* This portion is furnished by the Rev. Andrew Fahnestock, of Snowhill, Pa.

We can no where in Scripture find an act repealing it; and therefore any other day instituted as the Sabbath, must of course be a human and not a divine invention; for the proof of which we might quote many passages from the Holy Scriptures, and also from respectable historians; but we wish to be as brief as possible with this article, and accordingly shall dispense with it. Baptism is administered among them by trine immersion: while the person is kneeling in the water, he is plunged three times forward under water, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" with the laying on of hands and with prayer while the person is yet in the water. Baptism is administered upon none but adults, though children of believing parents are received into the church, by the laying on of hands, and calling upon the Lord to bless them, according to the example of Christ, Mark x. 16, at which time it is supposed to have been instituted. They also practise the washing of feet before the Lord's supper, which they celebrate in the evening. Open communion is an established rule of the church. They disclaim the right of withholding the holy sacrament from any one who expresses a desire to partake of the same, or to judge who is worthy or unworthy; but they rather adhere to the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 28: "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." Chap. iv. 5: "Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God." They also consider it essential to adhere literally to the time, manner, and practice, of all the ordinances and injunctions of Christ, as they are recorded in the gospel, as near as they are capable of comprehending them; as they believe, that to deviate from the letter is to deviate from the spirit of it.

CATHOLIC, ROMAN.

BY PROFESSOR W. JOS. WALTERS,

PHILADELPHIA.

THE Roman Catholic Church, as it exists on this side of the Atlantic, may date its origin from the discovery of the western world. From the memorable day, October the eleventh, 1492, on which Columbus landed upon the island of Guanahani, or San Salvador, and at the foot of the cross poured forth his fervent thanks to God for the success of his glorious enterprise: this church has, amid many reverses, continued gradually to advance. If in some quarters she has met with reverses, her losses have been compensated by what she has gained in other directions; so that the number of her adherents, according to recent and respectable authorities, may, at the present time, be estimated at about twenty-five and a half millions, spread over the whole American continent. This ancient church, therefore, outnumbers by nearly ten millions, even in the new world, all the various Protestant denominations put together. Of this large body, however, only about 1,300,000 at the highest calculation, are found in the United States.

A Catholic navigator, whose name will be forgotten only in the wreck of the world, having thus discovered this vast continent, and another son of the church having given it its name: it was likewise by the illustrious Catholics John and Sebastian Cabot, and Verragani, in the service of the Catholic kings Henry VII. of England, and Francis I. of France, that the shores of the United States were first discovered and explored. This took place between the years 1497 and 1524. Farther north, the noble-hearted James Cartier discovered, in the course of three successive voyages, the gulf and river of St. Lawrence, and laid the foundations of the present flourishing cities, Quebec and Montreal.

It is, however, to that portion of the new world which the American fondly hails as his native land—the United States, and to the origin

and progress of the Catholic religion within its borders, that we now confine our attention.

And here with unfeigned pleasure, with honest and heartfelt satisfaction, does the American Catholic challenge the attention of his countrymen to the first settlement of the Maryland colony; for the early history of that colony, is the early history of Catholicity in these United States.

The following is an outline of this memorable epoch in our annals. Lord Baltimore having obtained from Charles I. the Charter of Maryland, hastened to carry into effect, the plan of colonizing the new province, of which he appointed his brother, Leonard Calvert, to be Governor. This first body of emigrants, consisting of about two hundred gentlemen of considerable rank and fortune, chiefly of the Roman Catholic persuasion, with a number of inferior adherents, sailed from England under the command of Calvert, in November 1632, and after a prosperous voyage, landed in Maryland, near the mouth of the river Potomac, in the beginning of the following year. The Governor as soon as he landed, erected a cross on the shore, and took possession of the country for *our Saviour*, and for our Sovereign Lord the King of England. Aware that the first settlers of Virginia had given umbrage to the Indians by occupying their territory, without demanding their permission, he determined to imitate the wiser and juster policy that had been pursued by the colonists of New England, and to unite the new with the ancient race of inhabitants by the reciprocal ties of equity and good-will. The Indian chief to whom he submitted his proposition of occupying a portion of the country, received it at first with sullen indifference, the result most probably of aversion to the measure, and of conscious inability to resist it. His only answer was, that he would neither bid the English go, nor would he bid them stay; but that he left them to their own discretion. The liberality and courtesy of the Governor's demeanour succeeded at length in conciliating his regard, and so effectively, that he not only promised a friendly league between the colonists and his own people, but persuaded the neighbouring tribes to accede to the treaty. Nay more, he said with warmth, "I love the English so well, that even if they should go about to kill me, while I had breath to speak, I would command the people not to revenge my death: for I know they would not do such a thing, except it were my own fault." Having purchased the rights from the aborigines at a price which gave them perfect satisfaction, the colonists obtained possession of a considerable district, including an Indian town, which

they proceeded immediately to occupy, and to which they gave the name of St. Mary's.

The tidings of this safe and comfortable establishment in the province, concurring with the uneasiness experienced by the Roman Catholics in England, induced considerable numbers of the professors of this faith to follow the original emigrants to Maryland, and no efforts of wisdom or generosity were spared by Lord Baltimore to facilitate the population, and promote the happiness of the colony. The transportation of people and of necessary stores and provisions during the first two years, cost him upwards of forty thousand pounds. To every emigrant he assigned fifty acres of land in absolute fee: and with a liberality unparalleled in that age, and altogether surprising in a Catholic, he united a general establishment of Christianity as the common law of the land, with an absolute exclusion of the political predominance or superiority of any one particular sect or denomination of Christians.

This wise administration soon converted a dreary wilderness into a prosperous colony. The opposition of the Virginia planters to the new colony, but still more the intrigues of the vindictive Clayborne, cast for a while a gloom over the early history of Maryland. Notwithstanding the misfortunes which attended and followed the rebellion of 1645, the same Assembly that enacted measures for the future protection and safety of the colony, made a magnanimous attempt to preserve its peace by suppressing one of the fertile sources of human contention and animosity. It had been declared by the Proprietary, at a very early period, that religious toleration should constitute one of the fundamental principles of the social union over which he presided, and the Assembly of the province, composed chiefly of Roman Catholics, now proceeded, by a memorable "Act concerning Religion," to interweave this noble principle into its legislative constitution. This statute commenced with a preamble declaring that the enforcement of the conscience had been of dangerous consequence in those countries where it had been practised, and therefore enacted that no persons professing to believe in Jesus Christ should be molested in respect to their religion, or in the free exercise thereof, or be compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion, against their consent; so that they be not unfaithful to the Proprietary, or conspire against the civil government; that persons, molesting any other in respect to his religious tenets, should pay treble damages to the party aggrieved, and twenty shillings to the Proprietary; that those, who should reproach their neighbours with opprobrious names of religious

distinction, should forfeit ten shillings to the persons so insulted ; that any one, speaking reproachfully against the Blessed Virgin or the Apostles, should forfeit five pounds ; but that blasphemy against God should be punished with death. By the enactment of this statute, the Catholic planters of Maryland won for their adopted country the distinguished praise of being *the first* of the American States in which toleration was established by law, and graced their peculiar faith with the signal and unwonted merit of protecting that religious freedom which all other Christian associations were conspiring to overthrow. It is a striking and instructive spectacle to behold, at this period, the Puritans persecuting their Protestant brethren in New England, the Episcopalians retorting the same severity on the Puritans in Virginia, and the Catholics, against whom all others were combined, forming in Maryland a sanctuary where all might worship and none might oppress, and where even Protestants sought refuge from Protestant intolerance.

If the dangers to which the Maryland Catholics must have felt themselves exposed, from the disfavour with which they were regarded by all other communities of their countrymen, and from the ascendancy which their most zealous adversaries, the Presbyterians, were acquiring in the councils of the parent state, may be supposed to account, in some degree, for their enforcement of a principle of which they manifestly needed the protection, the surmise will detract very little from the merits of the authors of this excellent law. The moderation of mankind has ever needed adventitious support ; and it is no deprecation of Christian sentiment, that it is capable of deriving an accession to its purity from the experience of persecution. It is by divine grace alone that the fire of persecution thus sometimes tends to refine virtue, and consumes the dross that may have adhered to it ; and the progress of this history is destined to show, that, without such overruling agency, the commission of injustice naturally tends to its own reproduction, and that the experience of it engenders a much stronger disposition to retaliate its severities, than to sympathize with its victims. It had been happy for the credit of the Protestants, whose hostility, perhaps, enforced the moderation of the Catholics of Maryland, if they had imitated the virtue which their own apprehended violence may have tended to elicit. But unfortunately, a great proportion even of those who were constrained to seek refuge among the Catholics from the persecutions of their own Protestant brethren, carried with them into exile the same intolerance of which they themselves had been the victims : and the Presbyterians and other dissenters, who now began to flock in con-

siderable numbers from Virginia to Maryland, gradually formed a Protestant confederacy against the interests of the original settlers; and with ingratitude, still more odious than their injustice, projected the abrogation not only of the Catholic worship, but of every part of that system of toleration under whose shelter they were enabled to conspire its downfall. But though the Catholics were thus ill requited by their Protestant guests, it would be a mistake to suppose that the calamities that subsequently desolated the province, were produced by the toleration which her Assembly now established, or that the Catholics were really losers by this act of justice and liberality. From the disposition of the prevailing party in England, and the state of the other colonial settlements, the catastrophe that overtook the liberties of the Maryland Catholics could not possibly have been evaded: and if the virtue they now displayed was unable to avert their fate, it exempted them at least from the reproach of deserving it: it redoubled the guilt and scandal incurred by their adversaries, and achieved for them a reputation more lasting and honourable than political triumph or temporal elevation. What Christian (however sensible of the errors of Catholic doctrine) would not rather be the descendant of the Catholics who established toleration in Maryland, than of the Protestants who overthrew it?

From the establishment of *religious* freedom, the Assembly of Maryland proceeded to the improvement of political liberty; and, in the following year, the constitution of this province received that structure which, with some interruptions, it continued to retain for more than a century after. In conformity with a wish expressed by the burgesses (in 1642) "that they might be separated, and sit by themselves, and have a negative," a law was now passed (1650), enacting that members called to the Assembly by special writ, should form the upper house; and that those who were chosen by the hundreds should form the lower house; and that all bills which should be assented to by the two branches of the legislature, and ratified by the governor, should be deemed the laws of the province. Blending a due regard to the rights of the people, with a just gratitude to the Proprietary, the Assembly at the same time enacted a law prohibiting the imposition of taxes without the consent of the freemen, and declaring in its preamble, "that as the Proprietary's strength doth consist in the affections of the people, on them he doth rely for his supplies, not doubting of their duty and assistance on all just occasions." (Laws, 1650, Cap. 1, 23, 25.) Perhaps (concludes the impartial Grahame) it is only under such patriarchal administration, as Maryland yet retained an admixture of in her constitution, and under such

patriarchs as Lord Baltimore, that we can ever hope to find the realization of the political philosopher's dream of a system that incorporates into politics the sentiments that embellish social intercourse, and the affections that sweeten domestic life. In the prosecution of its patriotic labours, the Assembly proceeded to enact laws for the relief of the poor, and the encouragement of agriculture and commerce. (Laws, 1649, Cap. 12 ; 1650, Cap. 1, 33.) And a short gleam of tranquil prosperity succeeded the calamities which the province was fated again to experience from the evil genius of Clayborne, and the interposition of the parent state.

We refer the reader who may wish to study the darker shades of this beautiful picture, to the pages of Grahame. We have no desire to awaken the recollection of the many wrongs sustained by the Maryland colonists. For peace' sake their unmerited sufferings may be passed over in silence ; but justice and truth alike demand that the above statements, from the pen of a Protestant historian, should be more generally known to the mass of our countrymen. Nor should we forget that, foremost among the colonists who thus hallowed the shores of the Potomac by their virtues, were members of the Society of Jesus ; the Fathers Andrew White and John Althano, both men of sterling worth and extensive learning ; here, as in every other quarter of the new world, their zeal, their learning and address, contributed greatly to the success of the early settlers.

It was on the 23d of March, 1634, the festival of the Annunciation of the ever blessed Virgin, and on St. Clement's Island, in the Potomac, that the divine sacrifice of the mass was for the first time offered up to God, in this portion of America. Governor Calvert, accompanied by Father Althano, then sailed up the river, landing first on the Virginia side, at an Indian town called Potomac, and now known as New Marlborough, or Marlborough Point. The Jesuit Father explained to the assembled Indians the chief mysteries of the Christian religion, as well as the peaceful and benevolent motives that actuated their unexpected visitors. It is remarkable that his interpreter on this occasion was a Protestant. Leaving the chief and his people favourably impressed, and even gratified at the arrival of the strangers, the governor sailed about twenty-five miles up the river, to Piscataway, in Maryland, the residence of the great king or chief of the neighbouring tribes. At the first sight of the party, the savages prepared to give them a hostile reception, but being informed of their peaceful intentions, the chief boldly stepped on board the governor's boat, and gave him permission to settle in any part of his dominions. (Oldmixon's Brit. Emp. in America.) It did not, however, seem safe for the Eng-

lish to plant the first settlement so high up the river. Calvert descended the stream, examining in his barge the creeks and entrances near the Chesapeake, entered the river now called St. Mary's, to which he gave the name of St. George's, about two leagues from its junction with the Potomac, having purchased the right to the soil from the natives, together with their good-will. The settlement was commenced by the Catholics on the 27th of March, and religious liberty obtained a home, its only home in the wide world, at the humble village which bore the name of St. Mary's. The able and eloquent historian of Maryland, McMahon, thus adverts to the sentiments which must naturally have stirred the hearts of the settlers at this moment: "To the feeble emigrants it was an occasion for joy, rational and profound. Preferring all privations to the privation of liberty of conscience, they had forsaken the endearments of their native land, to cast themselves, in reliance on divine protection, upon all the perils of an unknown country inhabited by a savage people. But the God in whom they trusted was with them, and he in whose hands are all hearts, seemed to have moulded the savage nature into kindness and courtesy. Where shall we find, in the history of any people, an occasion more worthy of our commemoration than that of the landing of the colony of Maryland? It is identified with the origin of a free and happy state. It exhibits to us the foundations of our government, laid broad and deep in the principles of civil and religious liberty. It points us with pride to the *founders* of this state, as men who for the secure enjoyment of their liberties, exchanged the pleasures of affluence, the society of friends, and all the endearments of civilized life, for the privations and dangers of the wilderness. In an age, when perfidy and barbarity but too often marked the advances of civilization upon the savage, it exhibits them to us displaying in their intercourse with the natives, all the kindness of human nature, and the charities of their religion. Whilst we would avoid all invidious contrasts, and forget the stern spirit of the Puritan, which so frequently mistook religious intolerance for holy zeal; we can turn with exultation to the 'Pilgrims of Maryland' as the founders of religious liberty in the new world. They erected the first altars to it on this continent, and the fires first kindled on it ascended to heaven amid the blessings of the savage."—McMahon's Maryland, pp. 196-8.

While the sires of the Catholic Church were thus at once building their altars and their homes on the verdant banks of the broad Potomac, the same church had sent forth not less devoted men, to bear the light of civilization and religion to other portions of our beloved country. Between the years 1634 and 1687, Catholic missionaries

had already traversed that vast region lying between the heights of Montreal, Quebec, and the mouth of the Mississippi, the greater portion of which is now known as the United States. Within thirteen years the wilderness of the Hurons was visited by sixty missionaries, chiefly Jesuits: one of their number, Claude Allouez, discovered the southern shores of Lake Superior; another, "the gentle Marquette," of whom Bancroft says "the people of the West will yet build his monument," walked from Green Bay, following the course of the Wisconsin, embarks with his beloved companion and fellow-missionary, Joliet, upon the Mississippi, and discovers the mouth of that king of rivers, the wild, the impetuous Missouri; a third member of this devoted band, the fearless Menan, settles in the very heart of the dreaded Mohawk country, on the banks of the river that still bears that name. The Onondagas welcome other missionaries of the same illustrious society. The Oneidas and Senecas likewise lend an attentive ear to the sweet tidings of the gospel of peace. When we consider that these missionaries were established in the midst of continual dangers and life-wasting hardships, that many of the Jesuit missionaries sealed with their blood the truth of the doctrines they preached, the sincerity of their love for those indomitable sons of the American forest: we are not surprised at the eloquent encomiums that have been passed upon their dauntless courage and their more than human charity and zeal.

"All persons," says one of our native writers, "who are in the least familiar with the early history of the West, know with what pure and untiring zeal the Catholic missionary pursued the work of conversion among the savages. Before a Virginian had crossed the Blue Ridge, and while the Connecticut was still the extreme frontier of New England, more than one man whose youth had been passed amongst the warm valleys of Languedoc, had explored the wilds of Wisconsin, and caused the hymn of Catholic praise to rise from the prairies of Illinois. The Catholic priest went even before the soldier and the trader; from lake to lake, from river to river, the Jesuits pressed on unrelenting, and with a power that no other Christians have exhibited, won to their faith the warlike Miamis and the luxurious Illinois. For more than a hundred years did this work go forward. Of its temporary results we know little. The earliest of the published letters from the missionaries were written thirty years after La Salle's voyage down the 'Great River.' But were the family records of France laid before us, I cannot doubt that we should there find evidences of savage hate diminished, and savage cruelty prevented, through the labours of the brotherhood of Jesus; and yet it was upon these men that England charged the war of Pontiac! Though every

motive for a desperate exertion existed on the part of the Indians, the dread of annihilation, the love of their old homes and hunting-grounds, the reverence for their fathers' graves—all that nerved Philip, and fired Tecumseh—yet, to the Protestant English, the readiest explanation was that Catholics, that Jesuits, had poisoned the savage mind." (Knickerbocker, June, 1838.) The regret expressed above, that we have not more copious and satisfactory information with regard to this earlier portion of American ecclesiastical history, may well be shared not only by the Catholic, but by all who take an interest in every thing relating to their native land. Meagre, however, as are the memorials of these primitive times, we have sufficient data to prove that there is not a State of our Union wherein Catholicity has obtained a footing, whose history does not exhibit many interesting traits of heroic self-denial, of dangers overcome, of opposition meekly borne, of adversaries won to our faith by the Catholic missionaries.

The name of the devoted and indefatigable Father Farmer, in Pennsylvania, is still venerated by all who knew him. Men of every religious persuasion followed his remains to the tomb; the last and unsought tribute of their respect for his many virtues. Amid the forests and snow-clad hills of Maine, a Rasle emulated the courage and toils of his brethren in the West. The late Cardinal Cheverus has left a reputation in Boston which will not be forgotten while the people of New England retain their wonted regard for genuine, manly worth; for talents, learning, and disinterested yet untiring zeal, all employed in that holiest of human enterprises, the promotion of God's glory and the happiness of man. Not less revered by the liberal-minded of every religious persuasion, is the memory of that "model of prelates, Christians, and scholars," the Right Reverend John Carroll, the first Roman Catholic Bishop of Baltimore. "No being," (says a writer in the *American Quarterly*) "no being that it has been our lot to admire, ever inspired us with so much reverence as Archbishop Carroll. We cannot easily forget the impression which he made a few years before his death, upon a distinguished literary foreigner, who conversed with him for a half-hour, immediately after the celebration of the mass, in his parlour, and had seen the most imposing hierarchs in Great Britain. The visitor seemed, on leaving the apartment, to be strongly moved, and repeatedly exclaimed, 'That, indeed, is a true archbishop!'" (March Number, 1827, p. 23.)

"The archbishop's patriotism" says the same writer, "was as decided as his piety. . . . He loved republicanism; and so far preferred his own country, that if ever he could be excited to impatience, or irri-

tated, nothing would have that effect more certainly, than the expression of the slightest preference, by any American friend, for foreign institutions or measures. He had joined with heart and judgment in the Revolution: and to his last hour he retained, without abatement of confidence or fervour, the cardinal principles and American sympathies and hopes, upon which he then rested. We may mention in fine, as evidence of the public confidence in his exalted character, that, in the year 1776, at the solicitation of the then Congress of the United States, he accompanied Dr. Franklin, Samuel Chase, and that other and illustrious Catholic, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, on a political mission to Canada, with a view of inducing the people of that province to preserve a neutral attitude in the war between the mother country and the United States.

Turning our eyes to another quarter of our Union, need we remind the intelligent reader of the solid and extensive learning, the stirring eloquence, the apostolic labours of an England?—beloved, honoured by men of every religious denomination, and even now lamented in the South as one of her best and noblest sons? But this is not the occasion to record the virtues or the toils of these and other kindred spirits of the Catholic Church in America. We confidently leave the task to worthier pens than ours.

From the foregoing observations some idea may be formed of the early history of Catholicity in these United States. For more accurate and detailed information we must refer the reader to the various articles in the Catholic periodicals and journals; among others, to several interesting historical papers in the “Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity’s Directory,” commencing with A. D. 1833, and continued to the present year. The “United States Catholic Magazine,” and the “Catholic Cabinet,” will also furnish several highly entertaining and satisfactory papers on the early history, progress, and present state of the Catholic Church among us.

THE NAME CATHOLIC.

“Catholic” is from a Greek word, signifying *whole, general, universal*; and is applied to the Church to designate the union in one body of all particular churches confessing one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and one God and Father. (Eph. iv. 5.) “The Catholic Church,” says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, “is so called, because she is spread over the whole habitable globe, from one end to the other;” (Catech. xviii.) and this in conformity with the declaration of our Lord, that “penance and remission of sins should be preached in his

name among all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem," (Luke xxiv. 47); and with his command to his Apostles, "Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature," (Mark xvi. 15); whence the saints are represented in heaven proclaiming, "Thou hast redeemed us to God in thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." (Rev. v. 9.)

Wherever a new doctrine has been preached in opposition to the doctrines of the existing Catholic Church, the patrons and followers of the new doctrine have derived their distinctive appellation from some circumstance peculiar to themselves; whilst the adherents of the old doctrine remaining in communion with the Catholic Church in other places, have retained their former name of Catholics. Hence St. Cyril (Anno 350,) tells his hearers, "When they go to a strange place, not to ask for the church simply—for the heretics have their places of worship—but to inquire where the *Catholic* Church is." (Catech. xviii.) And St. Augustine (Anno 400,) remarks, that "though all heretics wish to be called Catholics, yet they never dare to point out their own meeting-house to a stranger, who inquires for the *Catholic* place of worship." (Cont. Epist. Fundam. c. iv.)

Thus it had been in all ages, from the foundation of Christianity; and thus it was in the beginning of the sixteenth century, when certain religious innovators made a formal protest against some of the doctrines taught by the Catholic Church of that period. From this protest they obtained the name of *Protestants* or *Protesters*; while the adherents of the ancient faith continued to be called Catholics. The separatists, however, soon experienced the inconvenience of which St. Augustine has spoken above. How could they protest against the doctrines of the Catholic Church, while in the creed they professed to believe the Catholic Church? To escape from this difficulty, some divines of other communions have maintained, that they (the Protestants) are the real Catholics, under the ingenious pretence that they teach the doctrines originally established by the Apostles in the Catholic Church. But this cannot avail them, for two reasons: 1st, The word *Catholic* has no direct reference to the truth or falsehood of doctrine. It points out *universality*; it designates "the Church spread over the whole inhabitable world,"—a designation to which they can have no claim. 2d. If their reasoning be admitted, we must concede the title of Catholic to every heterodox sect that ever had existence. For all these sects believed that their peculiar doctrines were true; and of course they might thence infer, as the divines in question do, that the doctrines in question were those of the Apostles, and gave to them a right to the appellation of Catholics.

So long as the creed is true, there must exist a Catholic Church, in which the reciters of the creed may profess their belief. There was, then, such a church when the so-called reformers were born. By Catholic ministers they were baptized; in Catholic doctrines they were educated; in the Catholic Church they were taught to believe. Subsequently they separated from her; a separation that certainly could not affect her right to the title of Catholic, which she had possessed for so many centuries. *She* still exists, and is still the same Catholic Church. *Their* followers also still exist, and may justly claim the names assumed by their fathers. They may be Anglicans, or Lutherans, or Calvinists, or Baptists, or any other denomination whatever: but one thing is certain,—they cannot be Catholics.

As to the term “*Roman Catholic*,” it shows the bond of union which binds the various churches of Christendom in the profession of the faith of the chief See of the entire Christian world. Hence, it always brings to the mind of the faithful in any clime, the great, primitive senior church, the Church of Rome; and as more nations became converted to the faith, they were called by their different appellations, as “*English Roman Catholics*,” “*American Roman Catholics*,” “*French Roman Catholics*,” &c.

“The reproachful epithets of ‘*Papist*,’ ‘*Romanist*,’ ‘*Popish*,’ ‘*Romish*,’ &c., are no longer applied to them (the Catholics,) by any gentleman or scholar.” (Rev. J. Nightingale, author of “*A Portraiture of Methodism*,” &c.)

The same liberal Protestant makes the following quotation from a sermon of Dr. Butler, preached at Cambridge, at the installation of the Duke of Gloucester: “Popery, as it is called, is still a fertile theme of declamation to the old women and children of the year 1811. This term *Papist* is reproachful, conveys an erroneous idea, keeps alive a dishonourable prejudice, and ought to be abolished; nor will I ever believe that man a sincere friend to Christian liberty, who persists in the use of it.”

THE DOGMAS OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

“We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then [we shall see] face to face. Now I know in part, but then I shall know even as I am known. And now there remain Faith, Hope, Charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity.” 1 Cor. xiii. 12, 13.

In these words the Apostle speaks of the natural blindness of men respecting religion. He teaches, that whilst we live in this lower

world, encompassed with clouds and darkness, we see faintly and obscurely the things that are above; that the revelations, made to us respecting a future world, are often wholly above our comprehension, and generally full of mystery and difficulty; that we shall never be able fully to comprehend them, till the veil is drawn aside by death, and we behold God face to face: in whom, as in a clear mirror, all truth and all knowledge will be found.

While here upon earth, there remains for our exercise three virtues, Faith, Hope, and Charity. These united, form an epitome of the whole duty of a Christian.

Faith serves as a remedy for our natural defects, and supplies the place of knowledge. It teaches us to believe, without doubting, doctrines which we cannot comprehend, on the testimony of God, who has taught them. It teaches us to put a restraint on the daring flights of reason, and to confine within its proper limits this noblest of our natural gifts: to employ it in examining the grounds upon which revelation rests, but not in discussing the credibility of any subject which it discovers to have been revealed; to wait with patience till our faculties are enlarged, and the obstacles to our knowledge removed, and in the mean time, with the humility and simplicity of children, to receive, venerate and love the hidden and mysterious truths taught us by the invisible and incomprehensible Deity.

Hope teaches us to look forward with humble confidence to future happiness. It is an essential doctrine of revelation, that God really and truly desires the salvation of all mankind; that he created all for this end; that with this view, Jesus Christ, his eternal Son, died upon the cross, and established the Church with all necessary helps to salvation; that consequently, if we do our best endeavours, we shall be saved, not indeed by our natural strength, for with this alone we can do nothing, but by the help of grace, which God is ever ready and desirous to impart to those who employ the proper means of obtaining it; that consequently, if any one is lost, his perdition is from himself alone, and that if any one despair or cease to hope, it must either be, that he refuses to do his best, or that he violates the doctrine of faith, and accuses God of injustice. Hope gives peace to the mind, not by imparting a certainty of future happiness, which even the apostle himself declares he did not possess, but by inspiring a firm yet humble confidence in the promises, the mercy, and the merits of Christ.

Charity is the first, the greatest, the most essential of all the Christian virtues. It is not synonymous with benevolence to the poor. It does not consist merely in relieving the distressed, comforting the

sorrowful, clothing the naked, and similar works of brotherly kindness; for St. Paul says, "If I distribute my goods to the poor, and give my body to the flames, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." (1 Cor. xiii. 3.) Charity, then, is something more than benevolence. It is a virtue which regards God as well as man. It would be a partial and imperfect virtue, indeed, if it excluded God, the most perfect, the most amiable, the only adorable being, the first of benefactors, the best of friends, the most tender and loving of parents. It teaches us to love God above all things, to prefer his law and will before every consideration, to make them the rule, guide, and criterion of our thoughts, our words, and our conduct. It prepares us at any moment to sacrifice whatever we value most in life, rather than violate the allegiance we owe to our sovereign Lord. It teaches us to worship him in the manner he requires, and consequently to follow the religion which we sincerely believe to have been established by him. For should any man say to God, "I love thee, O God, but I will not worship thee in the manner which thou hast commanded, but in a manner which I consider as good or better," would he not offer an affront to God? Would he not be considered as a rebel against the divine majesty? Would not his selfish homage be rejected with disdain?

This sacred virtue teaches us to love every neighbour as ourselves, in thought, in word, and in deed. It forbids us to think unkindly, or to judge rashly of any human being; it commands us to put the best construction on his conduct, to excuse it when we can, and palliate it when it will not admit of excuse, and this, even though our judgments be confined to the secrets of our own breasts.

Still more does it require that our words be regulated by the same principles: that nothing escape our lips which can injure our neighbour's reputation, or disturb his peace of mind; that, when occasion offers, we undertake his defence, excuse his defects, extenuate his errors, and proclaim his merits. It teaches us to assist him in his distress, comfort him in his sorrows, advise him in his doubts, correct his errors, and, as far as lies in our power, promote all his temporal and spiritual interests.

Such is the virtue of charity, which the Apostle declares to be the greatest and most essential of Christian virtues. It is a universal virtue. It admits of no exception. It extends to God and to our fellow creatures of every country, of every colour, of every disposition, of every opinion, of every sect. The man who should exclude from his universal charity one single child of Adam, be his country, his conduct, his religion, whatever it may, transgresses this first of the divine commands, and becomes guilty of all. (James ii. 10.)

ONE GOD IN THREE DIVINE PERSONS.

The Catholic Church holds, as the foundation of all religion, that there is but one supreme, self-existent, eternal Deity, infinite in wisdom, in goodness, in every perfection; by whom all things were made, in whom all that exist "live, move, and have their being." (Acts xvii. 28.) It teaches that our first duty is, to love God, and adore him alone; that the worst of treasons and the greatest of crimes is, to give his homage to any creature whatsoever. It teaches that in this one God, there are three divine persons, perfectly distinct in personality, perfectly one in nature; that the second Person descended from heaven, became man, and died upon a cross for the salvation of all mankind: that through his blood all may be saved, and that there is "no other name under heaven given to men, in which any one can" obtain salvation, (Acts iv. 12;) that all spiritual graces and blessings actually bestowed in this life, or hoped for in the next, must be derived originally from the sufferings and merits of the divine Redeemer alone.

REDEMPTION THROUGH CHRIST.

Catholics believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God; who, for us sinners and for our salvation, was made man, that he might be the Head, the High Priest, the Advocate and Saviour of all mankind. We acknowledge him our only Redeemer, who paid our ransom by dying for us on the cross; that his death is the fountain of all our good; and that mercy, grace and salvation can by no means be obtained but through him. We confess him to be the Mediator of God and man, the only Mediator of redemption, and the only Mediator of intercession too: who intercedes in such manner as to stand in need of no other merits to recommend his petitions. But as for the saints, although we address ourselves to them, and desire their prayers, as we do also to God's servants here upon earth, yet we mean no otherwise than that they would pray for us, and with us, to our common Lord, who is our God and their God, through the merits of the same Jesus Christ, who is our Mediator and their Mediator.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Catholics believe that the Holy Ghost, the third person of the blessed Trinity, proceeds from the Father and the Son, and is equally God

with them, and that he is "the other Comforter" promised to the apostles, to abide with the church for ever. The Holy Spirit descended on our Saviour in the form of a dove, a fit emblem of that peace, that reconciliation between God and man, which he was about to accomplish by his death. The same Holy Spirit descended on the disciples in the visible form of fire, an emblem of that supernatural change which he was about to work in their hearts, by the purification of their feelings and aspirations from the dross of sensual ideas and affections. "And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him: but you shall know him, because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you. These things have I spoken to you, remaining with you. But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said to you." (St. John, xiv. 16, 26.) By the term "Paraclete" is understood a comforter, or an advocate; inasmuch as by inspiring prayer, he prays, as it were, in us, and pleads for us. It is also evident from the above texts, that this Spirit of truth was promised, not only to the persons of the apostles, but also to their successors through all generations.

Again: Christ's last words, before ascending up to his Father, were: "But you shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth." (Acts, i. 8.) In the following chapter of the Acts we see the fulfilment of this promise, and hear the testimony of the chief of the apostles: "This Jesus hath God raised up again, whereof we all are witnesses. Being exalted, therefore, upon the right hand of God, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath poured forth this which you see and hear." (Acts, ii. 32, 33.)

JUSTIFICATION.

It is the Catholic belief that no man can be justified, either by the works of nature, or of the law of Moses, without faith in Jesus Christ. That we cannot by any prudent works merit the grace of justification. That all the merit of our good works is the gift of God; and that every merit and satisfaction of ours entirely depend on the merits and passion of Christ. Or, in other words, that our sins are gratuitously remitted to us by the mercy of God, through the merits

of Jesus Christ; and that whatever good works we do, they are, all of them, the effects of God's grace.

"We are justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood" (Rom. iii. 24); "In Christ we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins" (Eph. i. 7); "And Christ hath washed us from our sins in his blood," (Rev. i. 5.)

So far the members of nearly all communions agree with the Catholic Church. They are, therefore, in agreement with her not only in charity, but in the profession of the primary and most essential doctrines of faith.* Beyond these primary articles, the generality of communions are not very rigid in exacting agreement from each other. Other points they consider as of smaller moment, and allow, in regard to them, a greater latitude of opinion. Surely, then, they will not refuse the same privilege to their Catholic brethren, which they allow to each other.

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

Jesus Christ laid the foundations of his church upon the authority of *teaching*; consequently the unwritten word was the first rule of Christianity, a rule, which, even when the books of the New Testament were superadded to it, did not, upon this account, lose any thing of its former authority. Hence it is that Catholics receive with equal veneration whatever was taught by the apostles, whether communicated by writing, or circulated only by word of mouth, according to the express declaration of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, commanding them "to hold fast the traditions which they had been taught, whether by word, or by epistle." (2 Thess. ii. 15.) Upon no point is the Scripture more express, than upon the subject of the authority of *teaching*: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) "Go forth to the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature." (Mark xvi. 15.) "For I have received of the

* "Under the Papacy are many good things; yea, every thing that is good in Christianity. I say, moreover, that under the Papacy is true Christianity, even the very kernel of Christianity."—LUTHER, *Book against the Anabaptists*.

"The Church of Rome is, no doubt, to be attributed a part of the House of God; and we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ."—HOOKER, *Ecclesiastical Policy*.

Lord that which also I have delivered to you." (1 Cor. xi. 23.) "Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast heard from me in faith." (2 Tim. i. 13.) "The things which thou hast heard from me, before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also." (2 Tim. ii. 2.)

There is nothing in the Scripture to intimate, that Christ ever commanded his disciples to compose a code of doctrine for the guidance of the faithful. In fact, it is clear from internal evidence, that the Scripture is not a doctrinal record. From an unprejudiced perusal of the different parts that compose the New Testament, it will evidently appear that the writers had their contemporaries principally before their eyes, and that instead of intending to leave behind them a perfect code of Christian doctrine for future generations, they presupposed, in their readers of that day, a previous knowledge of such doctrines. When they make mention of doctrinal matters, it is only incidentally, or by way of explanation. Hence it happens that, when men seek to form a system of theology from the sacred writings, they are compelled to go backward and forward, from gospel to epistle; to take part of a passage from one, and part from another; to tack the several fragments together, and out of them all to form a piece of patchwork, which they call the religion taught by Christ and his apostles.

Now it is plain that in a creed compiled after this fashion, much must depend on the skill and judgment of the workman; and as it is very seldom that we meet with any two men possessing exactly the same skill and judgment: we must expect to meet with very great differences in the religious systems formed by different teachers. And thus it is in fact. The Trinitarian pronounces from the Scripture that Christ is God; the Unitarian, that he is not God but man only; the Presbyterian infers from it that Episcopacy is no divine ordinance; the Independent, that the Presbyterian system is as contrary to Scripture as the Episcopalian; the Baptist is convinced that the baptism of infants is anti-scriptural; the Quaker, that it is to be administered neither to infants nor to adults. Thus it is with all the sects, which a belief in the private interpretation of Scripture has created; they all, on the testimony of Scripture, contradict one another, betraying by such contradiction the insecurity of that common principle on which they found their respective creeds, and renouncing all claim to that certainty of belief, which is due to the truths revealed by God to man. Another consideration must present itself to the reflecting mind. If the Scriptures are the only rule of faith, then those who cannot read are left without any rule at all.

Now previous to the invention of printing the great mass of mankind, for fourteen hundred years, were unable to read. Will any one venture to say, that God abandoned such multitudes of Christians for so long a period without a rule? Perhaps it may be replied, that their pastors explained the Scriptures to them; but then a contradiction arises: two rules are established in place of one only rule, making the church the rule for the ignorant, and the Scriptures the rule for the learned. Again, in the case of those who can read, surely it may flatter the pride, but at the same time deceive the simplicity, of those who do not understand the learned languages, to bid them search the Scriptures, and judge for themselves from the word of God. They may come to suspect, nor will their suspicions be unfounded, that the versions put into their hands are not the word of God, but in part the work of man, of uninspired man, and men prepossessed in favour of some particular doctrines; and therefore liable, even without intending it, to misinterpret passages bearing on their own particular doctrines. What security then can the reader, unversed in any language but his own, have, that by searching in such versions, he is doing what he is told to do, that is, culling the doctrines of his creed from the inspired word of God? Evidently he has none.

The Catholic Church maintains, that there are doctrines of essential importance not contained in the Scriptures; as for instance, the lawfulness and obligation of keeping holy the Sunday, instead of the Saturday, the real scriptural sabbath; the validity of infant baptism, &c.

And even if all the doctrines of religion were actually contained in the Bible, still the rule of Catholic belief would not be the Scriptures explained by private interpretation, but by the teaching of the Apostles and their successors.

THE SCRIPTURES IN THE VULGAR TONGUE.

The Scriptures, in which are contained the revealed mysteries of divine truth, are the most excellent of all writings. They were written by men divinely inspired, and are "not the word of men, but the word of God, which can save our souls." (1 Thess. ii. 13, and James i. 21.) But then they ought to be read, even by the learned, in the spirit of humility, and with a fear of mistaking their true sense, as many have done. Of this we are admonished by the Scripture itself, where St. Peter says, that in the Epistles of St. Paul there "are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own perdition."

(2 Peter iii. 17.) Let every reader of the sacred writings, reflect on the words of Isaias: "My thoughts are not as your thoughts, neither are your ways as my ways, saith the Lord; for as the heavens are exalted above the earth, even so are my ways exalted above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts," (chap. lv. 8, 9.) How then shall any one, by his private reason, pretend to judge, to comprehend, and to demonstrate, the incomprehensible and unsearchable ways of God?

The Catholic Church, anxious to prevent this abuse, and to guard against error, has exhorted her children to seek the advice of the pastors and spiritual guides whom God has appointed to govern his church, (Acts xx. 28,) in regard to the indiscriminate reading of the Scriptures. It is not forbidden to read them: it is forbidden to read so as to abuse them.

The following extract from a letter of Pope Pius the Sixth, to Archbishop Martini, on his translation of the Holy Bible into Italian, shows the benefit which the faithful may reap from reading the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. "At a time that a vast number of bad books are circulated, to the great destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well, that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures; for these are most abundant sources, which ought to be left open to every one, to draw from them purity of life and doctrine; to eradicate the errors which are widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have seasonably effected, by publishing the sacred writings in the language of your country, so as to place them in the reach of all." Given at Rome, April 1778.

THE CHURCH.

When the Divine Author of the Christian religion had given all necessary instructions to his apostles, and communicated to them the Holy Spirit, to assist and direct them, he assembled them together on Mount Olivet, and thus addressed them: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20.) In another of the gospels, the same commission is given in somewhat different terms: "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be condemned." (Mark xvi. 15, 16.) [In the

translation, published by authority under James I., the words are, "He who believeth not shall be damned."]

On another occasion, Christ had said to Peter, "Thou art Peter," (which name signifies a rock,) "and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c. (Matt. xvi. 18, 19.) The conclusions we draw from these texts are—

That as Christ commissioned his apostles to teach all the doctrines of his religion to mankind, so he required mankind to receive these doctrines, and this under the severest penalty: "Go ye," my apostles, go ye, and teach mankind "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." "He that believeth not, shall be condemned." Therefore we are not at liberty to believe what we please, but our salvation is attached to the belief of the very doctrines taught by the apostles.

With respect to the apostles, it will be readily admitted, that there was an obligation of believing their doctrines. Which of us would have ventured to contradict St. Paul to his face, to tell him that we did not understand the Bible in the sense he taught, and that we had a right to explain its meaning for ourselves? Would he have acquiesced in our claims? Would he not rather have pronounced upon us the anathema, which he declared he would pronounce even upon an angel from heaven, who should teach doctrines different from those which he had preached? (Galat. i. 8.) Would he not have said to us, as he said to the Corinthians,—“Keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you: but if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the church of God.” (1 Cor. xi. 2–16.)

But why should the apostles be entitled to an obedience which is refused to their successors? The apostles had no power but such as they received from Christ; no security against error, but such as they derived from his guidance and protection. Now the same powers, the same guidance and protection, were promised to the successors of the apostles as were promised to the apostles themselves. Christ did not send to the apostles the "Spirit of Truth," to "teach them all truth" (John xvi. 13,) only for a limited time, but "for ever." (John, xiv. 16.) He did not promise to be himself with his apostles merely during their short lives, but "all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 20.) The Catholic Church, therefore, believes that the same submission is due to the lawful successors of the apostles in the first, the second, and the nineteenth century of Christianity, as was due to the apostles themselves. Where does Scripture teach that the doctrines of the apostles should be received,

and those of their successors rejected? Where does it teach that, after the death of the apostles, the commission to teach mankind should be transferred from the living pastors of the church, to the dead letter of the Bible? Where does it recall the solemn denunciation pronounced against those who refuse to "hear the Church?" (Matt. xviii. 17.) Where does it retract the promised guidance of the Spirit and the pledged protection of Christ? In what age of Christianity did the great body of believers adopt the modern principle of private interpretation? Most of the apostles were dead before the whole of the New Testament was written; near four hundred years had elapsed before its different books were collected together and fully authenticated; the gospel had been preached, and Christianity planted in many nations, before a single copy of the New Testament had reached them; more than fourteen centuries had passed over the Christian Church, before the invention of printing rendered it possible for one Christian in a thousand to possess a copy of the Scriptures, or one in ten thousand of the people to read it. Could Christ intend that men should follow a rule of faith, to which they could not obtain access? To read a book which was not written, or could not be obtained? to explain a book which, if they possessed, they could not read? Could he require that the ignorant and unlettered should understand a book, which the wisest and most learned cannot always comprehend? Could he require, as a condition of salvation, that the peasant, the day-labourer, the woman, the child, unacquainted with the languages, the history, the usages of antiquity, should fathom the depths of the most ancient, the most profound, and the most mysterious volume that ever was penned; a volume, in which the great St. Augustin declared he found more which he could not, than which he could comprehend; the contents of which he could never have brought himself to believe, "if the authority of the Catholic Church had not moved him to it?" (Contra ep. Fundam.) Whilst a human legislator would deem it the height of folly to write his laws, and leave them without authorized living expositors, can we suppose that the Divine Legislator would be guilty of such an inconsistency? Whilst the generality of men are acknowledged to require the aid of living teachers in every science, in every art, in almost every mechanical trade: can we believe that the wisdom and goodness of God would leave them without this assistance in religion, the most difficult and the most important of all sciences? Could Christ require, under pain of damnation, that all men should believe the same doctrines, and yet require them to find these doctrines in a book, which is capable, as fatal experience too clearly proves, of being understood in a thousand

different senses, and which perhaps no two unassisted men ever understood in the same? Tertullian, a learned writer of the second century, tells us, "That whenever any refractory Christian, in those days, refused to submit to the doctrines of the Catholic Church, he claimed a right to explain Scripture for himself, and to make it teach whatever doctrines he chose to adopt." (*Lib. de præscriptionibus.*) The same has been the refuge of all subsequent innovators. There is no error, extravagance, or impiety, which private interpretation has not maintained to be the infallible word of God. Hence the Catholic Church continues to adhere to the ancient rule, which guided the faithful in the days of the apostles, and which has preserved unity of faith amongst their successors through every age.

But should these reasons be deemed insufficient to justify the submission which Catholics yield to the decisions of the church, and should it be insisted that every principle of religion shall rest on the private interpretation of Scripture: there can be no objection, in the present instance, to comply with the demand. What does the Scriptures say on this head? "If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." (*Matt. xviii. 17.*) "Into whatever city you (my apostles) enter, and they receive you not—I say to you, it shall be more tolerable at the day of judgment for Sodom, than for that city. He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." (*Luke, x. 10, 12, 16.*) "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned." (*Mark, xvi. 16.*) "Remember your prelates who have spoken to you the word of God: whose faith follow. Obey your prelates, and be subject to them, for they watch, being to render an account of your sins." (*Hebrews, xiii. 7, 17.*)

These, and many other similar texts, are sincerely understood by every Catholic to require submission to the church in matters of faith and morality, and consequently, to forbid all opposite interpretation of Scripture. And shall the Catholic be denied the right assumed by all other communions of judging of the sense of Scripture? If he understand the Scripture as teaching submission to the church, why should an objection be raised to his following the convictions of his conscience? A right is claimed to explain Scripture differently from him; why should the persons claiming such a privilege refuse him the right of explaining it differently from them? He calls not for their approval of his opinions; he objects not (on his own account) to their dissent. He is willing to abide the decision of an all-seeing Judge, and to incur the threatened condemnation, if his faith be erroneous. By the same tribunal will those who differ from him be

tried. Let them be satisfied with this, and not expect that their Catholic brethren will prefer their opponent's convictions to their own. Let the liberty claimed be reciprocal: "As you would that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner." (Luke vi. 31.)

But, it may be asked, why, upon the supposition that the lawful successors of the apostles are authorized teachers of religion and expositors of Scripture, does the Catholic assume that the pastors of his church are the lawful successors of the apostles, and the Catholic Church the only church of Christ? The reasons will be best given by recurring to the different texts of Scripture already cited. From those texts it may be inferred, first, that certain revealed doctrines are essentially required to be believed. "He who believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark, xvi. 16.)

It may be inferred, secondly, from the commission of Christ, "Go teach all nations," (Matt. xxviii.)—"Go preach the gospel to every creature," (Mark, xvi.)—that the religion of Christ must be a universal, not a national or merely local religion. Now the Catholic is the only universal religion. It is morally universal as to place; for it exists in every known country of the world. In many countries, it is the only religion; in most, its numbers greatly predominate; in every country, where Christianity exists in any form, there the Catholic religion is found. It is comparatively universal as to numbers, being infinitely more numerous than any other sect or denomination of Christians, and perhaps than all other sects and denominations put together. All other religions or sects are confined to comparatively narrow limits. They are national or local establishments. They are the church of England, the church of Scotland, the church of Geneva, the Greek, or the Russian church, existing in the particular countries which give them their names, and scarcely known in other parts of the world. Not one of them has the slightest pretensions to be the church of "all nations." Hence, it may be concluded, that none of them can be the church which Christ commanded his apostles to found for the benefit of the world at large, into which the prophet had predicted, that "all nations should flow." (Isaiah, ii. 2.)

3dly. The doctrines which the apostles were commanded to teach, were those and only those which they had learnt from Christ: "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. xxviii.) Therefore the doctrines of the true and universal church of Christ must be in all places the same; for where there is difference of doctrine, there must necessarily be deviation from the

doctrines of Christ. Now this unity of doctrine exists in the great Catholic Church, and in it alone. Though spread through every nation of the known world, though professed by so many "peoples, and tribes, and tongues," differing from each other in manners, in customs, in language, in interest, the doctrines of the Catholic religion are every where the same. Not a difference will be found on any single article of faith, amongst all its countless millions. Let the experiment be made. Let the first bishop or priest you meet with be consulted, as to what is the doctrine of the Catholic Church in any given article of faith, and let his reply be carefully noted. Let the same question be put to any bishop or priest of France, of Italy, of Germany, of Spain, of Hindoostan, of China, and from all and every one the same answer will be received. One and all will unhesitatingly say, "such is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, such is my sincere belief." Surely candour must acknowledge that this is as it ought to be. Unity like this is indispensable in any church which lays claim to teach the uniform and unchangeable doctrines of Christ.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH IN MATTERS OF FAITH.

If it be true that the Son of God took upon himself our nature, not only that He might die for our salvation, but also that He might establish a church to teach his doctrine, and to dispense to mankind the benefit of his death; it surely follows, as an indisputable consequence, that He would moreover preserve that church from falling into doctrinal or practical error; otherwise, we must suppose that a God of infinite power and wisdom, having a particular end in view, adopted, for the accomplishment of that end, means calculated to frustrate his own purpose; that he founded a church to teach truth and holiness, and yet permitted her, while she taught under his auspices, to become the propagator of error, and the corrupter of morality.

Now, that he promised to preserve her from error, is manifest. 1. He promised to his apostles, that the Spirit of truth should abide with them,—how long? For the term of their natural lives? No, for ever (John xiv. 16); and therefore not with them only, but also with their successors. 2. He promised to remain with them himself,—how long? Only whilst they preached the gospel? No: but all days, even to the consummation of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20); a promise which must also extend to their successors. 3. He appointed Peter the rock, and declared that against his church, founded on

that rock, the gates of hell should never prevail. (Matt. xvi. 18.) The infallibility of the church plainly follows from this text:* for it is manifest that, if the church ever fell into doctrinal error,—if she ever taught blasphemy, sacrilege, and idolatry, as is often stated in the “vain and profane babblings of men, who speak evil of things which they know not” (1 Tim. vi. 20; Jude i. 10),—then the gates of hell have prevailed against the church, and the declaratory promise of our Saviour has been falsified.

It should, however, be remembered, that when we deduce from these premises, that the church cannot err in matters of faith, we claim no infallibility in such matters for any individuals; but mean, that God, by his superintending providence, will so watch over his church in her decisions, as never to suffer her to become the teacher of error in point of religious doctrine.

THE SACRAMENTS.

Catholics believe that the sacraments of the Christian covenant are not only sacred signs representative of grace, but also seals which insure and confirm the grace of God to us, and the instruments of the Holy Spirit, by which they are applied to the souls of men. In other words, a sacrament is an external rite, ordained by Christ,—the visible sign of an invisible grace or spiritual benefit bestowed by God on the soul. Every sacrament, therefore, imparts such grace, as often as it is received with due dispositions.

The Catholic Church recognizes seven sacraments, viz., Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Order, Matrimony.

Of these seven sacraments five are common to all: for, by baptism we are spiritually born again; by confirmation our weakness is strengthened; by the eucharist we are fed with the bread which comes down from heaven; penance restores the soul from sickness to health; and by extreme unction it is prepared for its departure to another world. Of the remaining two, holy order supplies the church with ministers, and matrimony sanctifies the state of marriage. Thus has the blessed Founder of Christianity, by the institution of these means of grace, provided for all the wants of man in his passage through life. The sacraments are the fountains of the Saviour, at which the Christian is to slake his thirst during his earthly

* “The only difference between the Church of Rome and our national church, in respect to the certainty of their doctrine is, that the former thinks it is *always infallible*, and the latter that it is *never in the wrong*.”—SIR RICHARD STEELE.

pilgrimage; the blessed sources whence, by divine appointment, he is to draw the waters of eternal life. "You shall draw waters with joy from the fountains of the Saviour." (Isaiah xii. 3.) And again: "If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink." (St. John vii. 37.) "He that shall drink of the waters that I will give him, shall not thirst for ever. It shall become in him a fountain of water springing up unto everlasting life." (Ib. iv. 14.)

BAPTISM.

Catholics believe that by the sacrament of baptism men are cleansed from sin, as well original as actual, and made members of the church of Christ, adopted children of God, and heirs to the kingdom of heaven. "God hath saved us, not by the works of justice which we have done, but according to his mercy, by the laver of regeneration, and the renovation of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath poured forth abundantly upon us, through Jesus Christ, our Saviour, that, being justified by his grace, we may be heirs, according to hope, of life everlasting." (Tit. iii. 5.) "Except a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) "Be baptized, every one of you; for the promise is unto you, and to your children." (Acts ii. 38, 39.)

With respect to the ceremonies used by the Catholic Church in the administration of baptism, they allude either to the state of the pagan before, or to the duties of the Christian after, baptism, and were originally performed, some of them during the instruction of the catechumen, and some during the administration of the sacrament. Some modern sects have thought proper to reject them all, under the idea that they are useless, and, as some of them assert, superstitious. The Catholic Church has preserved the ancient ritual. Other churches betray the newness of their origin by the newness of their service. It is the pride of Catholics to practise the ceremonies practised by their forefathers; they are respected by them as having been established by the founders of Christianity, and are cherished as evidences of their descent from its first professors.

CONFIRMATION.

Catholics believe that, through the sacrament of confirmation, they receive the Holy Ghost, to enable them to overcome temptations to sin, and to suffer persecution for the name of Christ. It is administered by the imposition of the hands, with prayer, and the unction of

the forehead with the holy chrism, accompanied by the words "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Confirmation completes what was begun in baptism. In baptism we enrol ourselves under the banners of Christ; in confirmation we receive strength to fight with courage the battles of our leader.

"Now, when the apostles, that were in Jerusalem, had heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent to them Peter and John; who, when they were come, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. For he had not yet come upon any of them; but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost." (Acts viii. 14-17.) "Having heard these things they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had imposed his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them." (Acts xix. 5, 6.) It is certain, from historical records, that what the apostles then did, the bishops, in every age from that time to the present, have continued to do, and for the same purpose, that is *to give the Holy Ghost*.

The following is the testimony of St. Cyprian: "It is necessary that he who has been baptized, should be moreover anointed; in order that having received the chrism, that is the unction, he may be anointed in God, and possess the grace of Christ." (Ep. l. 20.) "It was the custom," say the Centuriators, "to impose hands upon those who were baptized, and to imprint upon their foreheads, with chrism, the sign of the cross."

PENANCE.

All the first Christians were converts from Judaism or Paganism, who, being instructed by the apostles, had received the sacrament of baptism, and in that sacrament the remission of their former sins. They were of the number of those of whom our blessed Lord had said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark xvi. 16.) It is plain that for this blessing they were indebted, not to their own merits, but to the mercy of God. "Not by works of justice which we have done, but according to his mercy. God hath saved us by the laver of regeneration, and renovation of the Holy Ghost." (Tit. iii. 5.) Hence it is that St. Paul, in his epistles to Christians, thus received into the covenant through baptism, continually reminds them that they had been justified, not by the works which they had done whilst they were Jews or Pagans, but by faith in Christ, which had

brought them to the grace of baptism. This, therefore, is the true meaning of "justification by faith and not by works." They had thus "been justified by the grace of God, and made heirs according to hope of eternal life." (Tit. iii. 7.) Hence, also, we may learn in what sense they were said to have been *saved* by the justification received in baptism. They had been taken out of the great mass of sinners, and placed amongst those who were heirs to eternal life: not heirs in actual possession, but *heirs according to hope*. Still it was possible that they might forfeit their inheritance. They *would* forfeit it if they relapsed into the sinful practices of their former life. Some did actually relapse, and "walk so as to be enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end would be destruction." (Phil. iii. 18.)

Now these men had already obtained, in baptism, the remission of their sins committed before baptism. Could they be baptized again to obtain the remission of their sins committed after baptism? No; "for it was impossible for those who had once been enlightened, who had tasted the heavenly gift, and who had been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, if they then fell away, to be renewed (baptized) again unto repentance; having crucified again the Son of God, and made a mockery of him." (Heb. vi. 4, 6.) "It had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they had known it, to turn back from the holy commandment delivered unto them." (2 Pet. ii. 21.) Were they then to despair of pardon? Certainly not; for, notwithstanding the severity of these warnings, they were still reminded that, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the just, who is a propitiation for our sins; and not for our sins only, but for those of the whole world." (John xi. 12.)

How, then, without a second baptism, was the sinner to be reconciled a second time with God? To this most important question—and the query is calculated to startle the man who looks upon the Scripture as the sole and sufficient rule for all Christians—the inspired writings return no direct or satisfactory answer. They repeatedly speak of the *first* reconciliation in baptism, but scarcely ever allude to reconciliation *after* baptism. For the manner in which this is to be effected there is no instruction in Scripture. For it we must have recourse to the practice of the Catholic Church in the more early ages; which practice, as it prevailed universally, must have been founded on the doctrine taught by the apostles. From it we learn that the *second* reconciliation required a longer and more laborious course than the first. Of the Jew or Pagan it was required, that he should believe, renounce his sins, and be baptized; but the offending Christian was excluded from the communion of the body

and blood of Christ, was called upon to confess his sins, was made to undergo a long course of humiliation and self-denial, and then to sue for absolution, which was often deferred till the approach of death. By such absolution he was reconciled through the sacrament of penance. We, indeed, who have been baptized in infancy, could not have committed any actual sin to be forgiven in baptism: but, like them, we were made in baptism heirs of heaven, and, like them, may, after baptism, forfeit that inheritance by sin. If such be our misfortune, there remains to us no other resource than that which was left to them. We must seek forgiveness through the same sacrament of penance.

SACRAMENTAL CONFESSION.

A slight acquaintance with the books of the New Testament will suffice to show, that the writers had no intention of defining, in them, the doctrines, or of regulating the practices, of the Christian religion. They presuppose in their readers a knowledge of both the one and the other. Hence, if they mention such practices, it is only incidentally, and without any full or minute description; so that, on the present subject of confession, though there can be no doubt that it was of divine institution, yet the practice is nowhere expressly recorded. From the very earliest ages, however, it has been considered as included in the power given to the apostles of forgiving or retaining sins; for, how could they exercise that office in a rational manner, without a knowledge of the spiritual state of the applicant, or obtain such knowledge but from his free confession of his sins? To it St. Paul appears to allude, when, writing to the Corinthians, he says: "God has given to us the ministry of reconciliation . . . he has placed in us the word of reconciliation . . . for Christ we beseech you, be ye reconciled to God." (2 Cor. v. 18-20.) Where, it may be remarked, that he is writing to persons who had already been baptized, and exhorts them to make use of the ministry of reconciliation entrusted to the apostles, which, in their case, can refer only to the pardon of sins committed after baptism. In like manner, St. John says, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins," (1 John i. 9,) where the confession of which he speaks is one, in virtue of which, God is bound, in faith and justice, to grant forgiveness. Moreover, St. James writes, "Confess, therefore, your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that ye may be saved" (James v. 16); which passage many of the ancient fathers explain of confession to a priest; because it is connected with the preceding verses, in which the sick

man is told to call in the priests of the church, to be anointed by them, and prayed for by them.

If it be objected that there is nothing positive in these passages, and that the confession there spoken of may be a general acknowledgment of sinfulness, or a private confession to God, or a public confession in presence of the congregation: the objection might be met by a reference to the practice of the apostles; and of that there can be no doubt, when we find in the most ancient Christian documents, that confession to priests, sometimes in private, sometimes in public, universally prevailed. Undoubtedly, a practice so humbling to human pride, as that of confession, could never have been introduced and propagated throughout the whole church, on any authority less than that of the apostles.

And what was the commission given to the apostles? Before his ascension into heaven, Christ breathed upon them and said, "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." (John xx. 23.) He had before said to the same apostles, "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven," (Matt. xviii. 18,) and to St. Peter he had said, that he gave to him "the keys of the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. xvi. 19.) Catholics conclude from these texts that Christ gave to his apostles and their successors in the ministry the commission to remit, under certain conditions, the sins of his people. What are these conditions? The first is sincere sorrow for the offence committed, and a firm determination of mind never to commit it again. Without this condition, it is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, universally received as an article of her faith, that neither priest, nor bishop, nor pope, nor the whole church together, has power to forgive any sin whatever; and that should any priest, or bishop, or pope, presume to grant absolution to any sinner, who was not from his heart sorry for his sins, and fully determined not to commit them again, such absolution could have no effect, but to augment the sinner's guilt, and involve in a participation of it the rash minister who had presumed to absolve him.

But, in addition to this, the Catholic Church requires that the sinner should confess his guilt to the minister of religion, in order that the latter may ascertain whether his penitent possesses the requisite dispositions, and that he may be enabled to prescribe the necessary reparation for the past and precautions against future transgressions. Unless a sinner is ready to make this full and undisguised acknowledgment of his offences, however painful, however humbling it may

be: the Catholic Church teaches, that her ministers have no authority to grant an absolution, and that should they presume to grant it, it would be of itself null and void.

Nor are the above conditions sufficient. The sinner must, moreover, submit to make such atonement to his offended God, by prayer, by fasting, by works of self-denial, and the like, as may be required of him; and if he has injured any neighbour in his good name, his property, or his person, he must, to the utmost of his ability, resolve to make full and ample satisfaction. Without such a resolution, no Catholic priest in the world could or would consider himself authorized to give absolution to any penitent; and if he did presume to give it, his religion teaches, as an article of faith, that his absolution could be of no avail in the sight of God, but would add to the guilt both of the giver and the receiver.

Now, it may be asked, is this a doctrine which relaxes Christian morality, which encourages guilt, and facilitates the commission of crime? What, then, must those doctrines be, which admit the sinner to reconciliation, upon the simple condition of repentance and a confession made to God alone?

As to the charge of forgiving sins for money, or allowing the commission of future sins, on any condition whatever, it is a simple calumny. The Catholic Church expressly forbids her clergy to receive money for absolution from sin, and would condemn, as guilty of simony, any priest who should commit such a crime. Accounts to the contrary, in which many works abound,—and frequently such works as would appear least likely to admit them,—are, like other similar charges, fabricated for purposes best known to the authors.

SATISFACTION.

According to the doctrine of the ancient church, if the convert to Christianity relapsed into the sins which he had abjured, he was subjected to a course of penance, partly in satisfaction to God, for the breach of his vows of fidelity to him, and partly in satisfaction to the church, for the scandal which he had given to it. In later ages, the severity of this discipline was abandoned; and only a portion of it remains in the satisfaction still enjoined in the sacrament of penance. The sinner who voluntarily punishes his sin, can in no wise displease God, or offer an injury to Christ, while he at the same time admits, that no satisfaction which he can make, can be of any avail, independently of the satisfaction of Christ. As well might it be said that prayer for mercy is injurious to the mercy of God, or to the atonement offered by our Saviour.

INDULGENCES.

Indulgences grew out of the church discipline just spoken of. In every case, the bishops were accustomed to mitigate the rigour, or abridge the duration of the penitential course, as circumstances appeared to them to require. Both in the imposition and the relaxation of such penance, they had the same object in view, the benefit of the sinner; and in both they believed themselves to be justified by the promise of our Saviour, that "whatsoever they should bind upon earth, should be bound also in heaven; and that whatsoever they should loose upon earth, should be loosed also in heaven." (Matt. xviii. 18.)

See 1 Corinthians, v. 3-5. In this passage St. Paul excommunicates the man who had been guilty of incest. But in the second chapter of the second Epistle,—having been informed of the sorrow and repentance of the criminal, he tells the Corinthians, that he remits the punishment which he had lately deemed so salutary. "Wherefore," he says, "I beseech you, that you would confirm your charity towards him. And to whom you have forgiven any thing, even I also. For what I forgive, if I have forgiven any thing for your sakes, I have done it in the person of Christ." This mitigation by St. Paul, is precisely what the Catholic Church means by an indulgence.

Most misrepresentation on the subject of indulgences has arisen from an ambiguity of language, in which the term "remission of sin" has been made to include "remission of the punishment due to sin;" in the same manner as we say, that a king has pardoned treason, when he has remitted, on certain conditions, the penalties of treason.

Every grant of indulgence requires in express terms, as a previous condition, true repentance, and the performance of all that is necessary for the forgiveness of the guilt of sin: so that, in fact, instead of being, as some persons have rashly said, an encouragement to sin, it becomes to those who avail themselves of it, a powerful incentive to virtue and religion.

An indulgence is still less "a license to commit sin," as others have falsely represented. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is, that no power on earth can give a license to sin. Again, it has been misrepresented as "a pardon for sin beforehand." But an indulgence, so far from being a pardon for sin beforehand, has no concern whatever with the pardon of sin in any form: it is confined solely to the temporal punishment which may be due after the guilt has been committed. As little can it be an encouragement to sin, when its very

condition is true repentance: otherwise, God might be said to encourage sin by promising exemption from eternal punishment to the repentant sinner.

EXTREME UNCTION.

Catholics believe that extreme unction is a sacrament, ordained for the benefit of those who are dangerously sick, both in remitting their sins, and alleviating their sufferings, according to the hidden designs of God's providence, and to the different degrees of faith and preparation in those who receive it.

It is administered in the manner described by St. James: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord."

Its effects are also declared by the same apostle: "And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."

"I acknowledge," says Calvin, "that extreme unction was used by the disciples of Christ, as a sacrament; for I am not of the opinion of those who imagine, that it was a corporal remedy." (*Comment. in Ep. Jac.*)

HOLY ORDER.

Holy order is a sacrament by which bishops, priests, and others are ordained to the ministry of the altar, and receive grace to perform their respective duties. The Scriptures inform us that our blessed Lord appointed his apostles to spread his religion and worship through the world; that they appointed others to aid them in this great work, ordaining such persons with fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands; and that this ordination conferred on the ordained certain spiritual graces, adapted to their respective duties.

"As the Father hath sent me, I also send you." (John xx. 21.) "Let a man so account of us, as of ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. iv. 1.) "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and teachers, . . . that henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine." (Eph. iv. 11, 14.) "Stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by the imposition of my hands." (2 Tim. i. 6.) "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which

was given to thee by prophecy, with the imposition of the hands of the priesthood." (1 Tim. iv. 14.)

As the New Testament contains no detailed account of the constitution of the Christian ministry, nor of the exact form of ordination: we must have recourse for information on those subjects to the most ancient ecclesiastical historians; and when we find in their pages the same gradation of office and authority in the sacred ministry, which still prevails in the Catholic Church, described as existing in every particular church, the only conclusion that can be reasonably drawn from such antiquity and universality is, that it was established by the apostles themselves, in conformity with the will of their heavenly Master. No other authority could have established it *every where*.

MATRIMONY.

Catholics believe that matrimony is a sacrament, by which the marriage covenant is sanctified and blessed, and the parties receive grace to fulfil the duties of the married state. "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and the church." (Eph. v. 31, 32.)

"Matrimony," says Luther, "is called a sacrament, because it is the type of a very noble and very holy thing. Hence," he adds, "the married ought to consider, and respect the dignity of the sacrament." —(*De Matrimonio*.)

The Catholic Church teaches that the marriage covenant cannot be dissolved by human authority. "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." (Matt. xix. 6.)

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

Catholics believe that, in the sacrament of the holy eucharist are the body and blood of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, under the outward appearance of bread and wine; that they are received in memory of his death for our redemption; that the soul is thereby filled with grace, and that a pledge is given to us of future glory.

Our blessed Lord, at his last supper, took bread and wine into his hands, blessed them successively, and gave them to his apostles, saying of the bread, "Take ye, and eat; this is my body;" and of the wine, "Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood." (Matt. xxvi. 26-28.) The real signification of these words is a subject of con-

troversy between Catholics and Protestants. The Protestant, arguing from the appearance of the elements to the meaning of the words, contends that, as there is no *visible* change in the bread and wine, the words must be taken in some figurative sense: the Catholic, arguing from the literal meaning of the words to the real state of the elements, contends that, as the meaning is obvious and positive, the bread and wine must have undergone some *invisible* change. He asks if such a change is impossible, and bids us look at Him who utters these mysterious words. Who is He? To judge from our senses, he is, indeed, a mere man, like ourselves. To-day he is sitting at table with his disciples,—to-morrow we shall see him in the agonies of death, hanging, like a malefactor, on the cross. But what says our faith? That he is not only man, but God; *that* God who inhabiteth eternity,—who by a single word called the universe into existence,—whose will all things must obey. Shall we then dispute the power of this God to work a change in the bread and wine, unless it be perceptible to our senses? Shall we dare to give him the lie, by denying that to be his body and blood, which he has declared to be so? The men of Capernaum did this, when they exclaimed, “How can this man give us his flesh to eat? It is a hard saying, and who can hear it?” (John vi. 60.) But then the men of Capernaum took him for a mere man; we believe that he is our God.

Hence it appears, that the real point in dispute regards the *power* of God. Unless you deny that it is possible for him so to change the substance of the elements, that Christ may say of them literally and with truth that they were his body and blood; or maintain that, if such change were wrought, it must of necessity fall under the cognizance of the senses: it will follow that you are bound to admit, with the Catholic, the conversion of the elements into the body and blood of Christ. The Scripture says, it is his body and his blood: who that believes the Scripture will dare to say, It is not his body, it is not his blood?

To escape from the difficulty, some theologians have sought shelter behind certain expressions of our Saviour, which they call parallel passages; because in them the verb *to be* has reference to a figurative meaning. But this is a miserable subterfuge. The most important in our Saviour's words, at the supper, is the demonstrative pronoun *this*:—*this*, which I hold in my hand, *is my body*. He has indeed said, I am *the* door, I am *the* vine; but when did he lay his hand on a door or a vine, and say, *This* door, or *this* vine, am I?

There cannot be a doubt that the apostles would teach the real meaning of these words to their disciples. Now we have, fortunately,

the means of ascertaining what was the belief of the Christians about half a century after the death of St. John, from the apology of Justin Martyr. It was his object to describe the acknowledged doctrines and practices of the converts, and to place them in the most favourable light before the eyes of his infidel sovereign. Now, if the eucharist had been considered nothing more than a figure, most certainly he would have said so at once: for there could be no need of concealment, where there was nothing which might be thought singular or unintelligible. But of the figurative doctrine he appears never to have heard. He states openly, that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ; and accounts for a belief of a doctrine so extraordinary and startling, because it was the doctrine of our Lord at his last supper. The following are his words:

“With us, this food is called the eucharist, of which it is not allowed that any other man should partake, but he who believes in the truth of our doctrines, and who has been washed in the laver for the remission of sins and for a new birth, and who lives according to the precepts which Christ has left us. For we do not receive these things as common bread and common drink; in the same manner as our Saviour Jesus Christ, becoming incarnate, through the word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation: so have we been taught that the food, with which by transmutation our flesh and blood are nourished, is, after it has been blessed by the prayer of the word that comes from him, the body and blood of him, the same incarnate Jesus. For the apostles, in the commentaries written by them, and called ‘gospels,’ have delivered to us that they were so commanded to do by Jesus, when, taking the bread, and having blessed it, he said, Do this in remembrance of me: this is my body; and in like manner, taking the chalice, having blessed it, he said, This is my blood: and distributed it among them only.”—*Just. Mart.* 97.

Assuredly, if the Catholic doctrine be false, the error must have introduced itself among Christians before that race of men, who had been instructed by the apostles, had become entirely extinct.

The change, effected by Almighty Power, of the substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, has, with great propriety, been termed transubstantiation; a word introduced to distinguish the real doctrine of the Catholic Church from the heterodox opinions of successive innovators. The term, indeed, is of more recent origin; but the doctrine designated by it is as ancient as Christianity. “Learn,” says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, (*Catech. Myst.* iv.) “that the bread which we see, though to the taste it be bread, is nevertheless not bread, but the body of Christ; and that the wine which we see, though to the taste it be wine, is nevertheless not

wine, but the blood of Christ." (See also pp. 281-289, ed. Oxon.) It would be difficult to express the doctrine of transubstantiation in clearer terms.

"I should have wished," says Luther, "to have denied the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, in order to incommode the papists. But so clear and so strong are the words of Scripture which establish it, that in spite of my inclination so to do, and although I strained every nerve to reach the point, yet, never could I persuade myself to adopt the bold expedient." (*Epist. Car. Amic.*) Again: "Among the fathers, there is not one who entertained a doubt concerning the real presence of Christ Jesus in the holy eucharist." (*Defens. Vers. Cænæ.*) He calls the contrary opinion "blasphemy, an impeachment of the veracity of the Holy Ghost; an act of treachery against Christ, and a seduction of the faithful." (*Ibid.*)

"Many Protestants," says Bishop Forbes, (A. D.) "deny too boldly and too dangerously, that God can transubstantiate the bread into the body of Christ. For my part, I approve of the opinion of the Wittenburg divines, who assert that the power of God is so great, that he can change the substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ." (*De Euch.*)

INVOCATION OF THE SAINTS.

When Catholics pray to the saints, they do no more than when they pray for their fellow-men upon earth; of the one and the other they ask the same thing—that they would pray to the common God and Father of all, both with them and for them.

If Catholics be asked, "Whether they do not make the saints their mediators?" their answer will be, "We make them so in no other sense, than we are mediators one for another." Nor does the passage of Scripture so often quoted, apply here: "There is but one mediator between God and man," because by mediator is here signified, one "who gave himself a ransom for all." (1 Tim. ii. 6.) In that sense, Jesus Christ is our only mediator. Did the mediatorship of Christ receive any injury, or disparagement, from the prayers addressed to the saints, then would it also be violated in like manner by the prayers which Christians reciprocally offer up for each other's benefit. When the Catholic says to his brother in Christ, "Pray for me to our common Father, to obtain for me those blessings which I myself may be unable or unworthy to obtain:" the same he says to the blessed mother of Christ, to St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, or any other of those holy persons, whose

acknowledged sanctity has procured for them, through the grace and merits of Christ, the friendship of God, and the happiness of heaven. Surely there is nothing wrong or unreasonable in this. The earthly trials of those holy persons are past, the veil of mortality is removed from their eyes, they behold God face to face, and enjoy without reserve his friendship and his love. May the pious Catholic not reasonably hope that their prayers will be more efficacious than his own, or those of his friends here upon earth? At least, there is nothing in reason or revelation to forbid him to do so. Let a case be supposed. A child has been deprived by death of a parent, who through life offered for him the most fervent supplications. Is it likely that the anxiety of a parent for the welfare of a beloved child wholly ceases in death? Should the child think not, and under this persuasion say, "O! my parent, think of me, love me, pray for me still. Forget not in your happy country your exiled child." Would this be impiety? Would this be robbing God of his glory, or Christ of his mediation? Would this be transferring to creatures, the honours and privileges due to God alone? Would this justify a man in judging harshly, speaking contemptuously, or acting unkindly towards his Christian brother?

The following texts are offered to the notice of those who would more closely examine the subject. "The angel Raphael said to Tobias: When thou didst pray with tears, and didst bury the dead, I offered up thy prayer to the Lord." (Tobias, xii. 12.) "This," says Judas, relating his vision, "this is Jeremiah, the prophet of God, who prays much for the people, and the holy city." (2 Mach. xv. 12, &c.) "I say to you, there shall be joy before the angels of God, upon one sinner that repents." (Luke, xv. 10.)

"And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and the four and twenty ancients, fell down before the Lamb; having each of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints." (Apocal. v. 8.)

In the early, we may say the earliest, ages of the church, the saints were invoked. Listen to St. Augustine. "Christians celebrate with religious solemnity the memory of the martyrs, that they may excite themselves to imitate their constancy, that they may be united to their merits, and may be aided by their prayers. But it is not to any martyr, but to the very God of the martyrs, that we raise our altars. To God alone, who crowned the martyrs, is the sacrifice offered." (*Cont. Faust.* xx. 18.)

And here be it observed, that to God it is said, "Have mercy upon us;" to the saints it is said, "Pray for us." It is surely not difficult

to discriminate between these two forms of address : the difference is immense.

On the subject of the invocation of the saints, that learned Protestant, Bishop Montague, has the following remarks : " It is the common voice, with general concurrence and without contradiction, of reverend and learned antiquity. And I see no cause to dissent from them [the Catholics], touching intercession of this kind. Christ is not thus wronged in his mediation. And it is no impiety to say, as the Catholics do, ' Holy Mary, pray for me.' " (*Invoc. of Saints.*)

" I allow," says Luther, " with the whole Christian church, and believe, that the saints in heaven should be invoked." (*De Purgat. Quorund.*)

ON GOOD WORKS.

Good works are twofold : religious works, which have for their immediate object the honour and worship of God ; and works of mercy or charity, which have for their object to relieve the wants of our neighbour, spiritual or corporal. To these works ample reward is promised : " Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat ; I was thirsty, and ye gave me to drink ; naked, and ye clothed me," &c. (Matt. xxv. 34.)

Nor will the smallest act of charity go unrequited : " Whoever shall give to drink to one of these little ones, a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, amen I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." (Matt. x. 42.)

Respecting the merit of these good works, the Catholic believes, that eternal life is proposed to the children of God, both as a grace, which is mercifully promised to them, and as a recompense, which, in virtue of this promise, is faithfully bestowed upon their good works. Lest, however, the weakness of the human heart should be flattered with the idea of any presumptuous merit : it is at the same time carefully inculcated, that the price and value of Christian actions proceed wholly from the efficacy of sanctifying grace, a grace gratuitously bestowed upon us, in the name of Jesus Christ.

Much unintelligible learning has been wasted in attempts to explain the doctrine, that we are justified by faith without good works. But on carefully weighing the passages on which this doctrine is founded, it will appear that the Apostle is not speaking of the justification of the Christian who has fallen into sin after baptism, but of the justification in baptism, of the man who has been converted from Judaism

or Paganism. (Tit. iii. 5, 7.) Such convert is justified, according to St. Paul, not in consequence of the works which he did while he was a Jew or a Pagan, but in virtue of his faith in Jesus Christ, who brought him to the water of baptism. But it must be remembered, that the faith which sufficed for his justification in that sacrament, will not suffice for justification after baptism. When once he is become a Christian, he must "be faithful in every good work." (Col. i. 10.) "Because faith without works is dead, and by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." (James, ii. 24, 26.) He has indeed begun well, but he is not yet secure of salvation; it is by good works "that he is to make his calling and election sure." (2 Peter, i. 10.)

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE, OR PURGATORY.*

It is the belief of the Catholic Church, as indeed it may be presumed of every communion, that all sins are not equal in malice and guilt; that a passing angry feeling is not so great a crime as murder, nor an idle word as blasphemy. Hence we believe that God does not punish all sins equally, but "renders to every one according to his works" (Matt. xvi. 27); that whilst he punishes the wilful, deliberate and mortal offender with the extremity of severity, even with everlasting fire, he inflicts upon the minor and more venial sinner chastisements less severe, and of limited duration. This belief is surely not unreasonable. In human laws there are gradations of punishment, corresponding with the gradations of crime. We should call the law unjust, that punished equally with death the child who pilfered an apple, or the wretch who had murdered his father. Are the laws of God alone unjust? Has he alone the privilege of punishing without discrimination? The Scripture expressly declares, that before the divine tribunal "men shall give an account of every idle word." (Matt. xii. 36.) Let us, then, make a supposition. A child arrived at the full use of reason, and knowing that every lie is a sin, to escape punishment, tells an untruth in a matter of trivial moment. There is not a doubt that a sin has been committed. Before the child has time to repent, an accident deprives him of life. What reception shall he

* This term is from a Latin root, which signifies to *cleanse* or *purify*. To the objection that the word is not in Scripture, it may be answered, that like the word "Trinity," (which also has no place in Scripture) the term "Purgatory" was introduced and adopted to express more conveniently by one word, what was previously expressed by metaphor or circumlocution. In this manner many new terms have been admitted into Christian theology; thus men believed in the three divine persons, long before they adopted the word "Trinity."

meet with at the bar of eternal justice? Will he be sentenced with the parricide to eternal flames? I need not give the answer. Reason revolts at the idea. He must then be punished for a time, and when he has atoned for his fault, be admitted to reconciliation. Such is the belief of the Catholic Church.

But if a temporary state of punishment be admitted, prayer for the dead must follow of course; as on the other hand, if heaven and hell are believed to be the only alternatives in the moment of death, prayer for the dead is vain: for in heaven relief is not wanted, and "from hell there is no redemption." Hence, when our friends are taken from us by death, and we have reason to hope (and when will not affection hope?) that these offences may not deserve the extremity of eternal punishment: we entreat the divine Goodness to shorten or alleviate their sufferings. Is this unreasonable? Is this superstitious? Is this unscriptural? Certain it is, that it is not uncharitable, and charity is the first of virtues.

"But the Scripture does not command us to pray for the dead." Neither does it forbid us. Why, then, may not the voice of nature, the dictates of reason, and the belief and usages of antiquity, be allowed to govern our conduct? At all events, if the Catholic does not think the practice repugnant to Scripture, why should he be condemned? Surely he has as much right as others to judge of the meaning of Scripture? And if his interpretation be confirmed by the constant belief of the Catholic Church, by the practice of his forefathers, by the dictates of nature, and the best feelings of the human heart: is he not abundantly justified in preferring his own firm conviction to the fluctuating opinion of his neighbours?

An assertion is often made, "That the ministers of the church claim the power of relieving souls from purgatory." This strange misrepresentation, though a thousand times proved to be groundless, is as often repeated. The Catholic priest claims no authority or jurisdiction over the dead. All he can do is to apply to the mercy of God in their behalf; but, like other men, he must ever remain uncertain respecting the efficacy of his prayers. He has, indeed, one advantage peculiar to the priesthood. He can offer sacrifice; and sacrifice under the new law, as well as under the old, has always been considered the most powerful means of moving God to mercy. Hence, if any one, in addition to his own private prayers, wish to have sacrifice offered for the souls of his departed friends, there is no doubt he must apply to the ministry of the priests; and if "They who serve the altar are entitled to live by the altar," (1 Cor. ix. 13,) no one, I presume, will deny, that the priest is as much entitled to a remuneration for the

labour he performs, as those who receive fees for the burial service performed over the dead ; nay, even for the administration of baptism, and for preaching the gospel. Would a Catholic be justified in saying, on this account, that, for a sum of money, these clergymen claim a power of remitting sin, and opening to their followers the gates of life ?

PICTURES AND IMAGES.

Catholics use paintings and images as the most fitting ornaments for churches, oratories, &c., and at the same time, as objects calculated to excite and keep alive feelings of devotion. As the principal among them the crucifix may be mentioned. It is not possible to gaze upon the figure of the Redeemer, nailed to the cross, with a vacant eye. It brings before the mind, in the liveliest manner, his goodness, who for us, and for our salvation, was pleased “to submit himself to death, even to the death of the cross;” and reminds us how criminal those sins must be which caused him to undergo such sufferings, and how sincere our sorrow should be in having participated in the commission of them.

But there are those who say, that “Catholics worship images, as did the pagans of old, and that, like them, they give to the works of man’s hands the glory due to the one eternal God.” The accusation is a common one ; and were it not that it proceeds from *otherwise* respectable sources, it might appear like insulting the understanding of the reader, to suppose him capable of believing them. For surely it is not possible, that, in an age, and a country which claims, and not unjustly too, to be one of the most liberal and enlightened upon earth, men should be found capable of believing, that the majority of the Christian world, the great, the good, the learned of almost every civilized nation under heaven, should be so ignorant, so debased, so stupid, so wicked, as to give divine honours to a lifeless and senseless image ! It is difficult to bring the mind to conceive it.

Among other texts of Scripture which bear upon this subject, the following are offered for consideration : Numb. xxi. 8, 9 ; John iii. 14, 15 ; Exod. xxv. 18, 22.

“The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, . . . Thou shalt also make two cherubim of beaten gold, on the two sides of the oracle. Let them cover both sides of the propitiatory, spreading their wings, and covering the oracle ; and let them look one towards the other, their faces being turned towards the propitiatory, wherewith the ark is to be covered ; in which thou shalt put the testimony that I will give

thee. Thence will I give orders, and will speak to thee over the propitiatory, and from the midst of the two cherubims," &c. (Exodus xxv. 18, &c.)

"And the Lord said to him (Moses), Make a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign. Every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live. Moses, therefore, made a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign, which when they that were bitten looked upon, they were healed." (Numb. xxi. 8, 9.)

"And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so must the son of man be lifted up. That whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting." (John iii. 14, 15.)

Like the invocation of the saints, the early use and veneration of their images are acknowledged. The centuriators allow that they were common in the third age of the church. "Eusebius," they say, "writes that he saw, in Asia, Christians who preserved the images of St. Peter, St. Paul, and of Christ himself." (*Cent. iii.*) The same writers add: "Tertullian seems to declare, that the Christians kept the image of the cross, both in their public assemblies, and private houses; and it was thence that the pagans called them worshippers of the cross." (*Cent. iii.*)

CEREMONIES AND VESTMENTS.

With respect to ceremonies and vestments, they should be viewed with the eye of antiquity. They are venerable relics of primitive times, and, though ill adapted to the youthful religions of modern times, well become that hoary religion, which bears the weight of so many ages. The ceremonies employed in the Christian sacrifice, as well as the sacerdotal vestments, have their model in the book of Leviticus, and, as nearly as the difference of the old and new laws permits, closely resemble those instituted by God himself. The Catholic Church deems them useful. They give a peculiar dignity to the sacred mysteries of religion; they raise the mind of the beholder to heavenly things by their various and appropriate import; they instruct the ignorant and keep alive attention; they give the ministers of religion a respect for themselves, and for the awful rites in which they officiate; but neither the ceremonies nor the vestments belong to the essence of religion. The Church established them in the first ages. She could, if she deemed it advisable, set them aside any day, and the sacrifice would be equally holy, though not equally impressive, if offered by the priest in a plain white surplice, or the ordinary costume of the day.

THE SERVICES IN THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

The reasons why, in the celebration of the mass, and of other services of the church, the Latin language is used, are simply these: First, the Latin and Greek were the languages most generally used, and almost the only written languages in the principal countries where the Christian religion was first promulgated. In these languages, therefore, the liturgy of the church was originally composed, nearly in its present form. When, several centuries afterwards, the languages of modern Europe began to be formed, the church did not think proper to alter the languages she had ever used in the celebration of the holy sacrifice. For if, on the one hand, these languages, by becoming dead, ceased to be understood by the unlearned, on the other, they became, like a body raised from death, immortal, unchangeable, and on this account the better adapted for preserving unaltered the awful doctrines and mysteries committed to their care. Would prudence have justified the setting aside the pure, the dignified, the immutable languages of the primitive church; languages which, though no longer spoken by the unlettered, were still, as they are to this day, the universal languages of the learned in every country, and the adoption in their stead of the numberless barbarous, half-formed and daily changing languages of modern Europe? Would it have been respectful, would it have been secure, would it have been practicable, to commit to these rude and uncertain vehicles, the sacred deposit of the faith and hope of Christians? For the use of the people, translations have been made, and abound in every Catholic country; but at the altar the priest continues to commune with God in the original languages, reciting the more sacred parts of the sacrificial rite in a low voice, which breaks not the awful silence, nor disturbs the deep recollections of the surrounding adorers. And yet this has been termed "praying in an unknown tongue," and for the purpose "of keeping the people in ignorance." Had the latter been the unwise policy of the Catholic Church, she would have commanded the clergy to give instructions and to preach in unknown languages; whereas these portions of the church ordinances are always in the vernacular language.

PROSELYTISM.

And here a few remarks may not be irrelevant, in regard to what is usually called proselytism. A degree of odium has become

attached to the term; all seem eager to disclaim it, as if it implied something criminal. Yet what is meant by proselytism? If it means converting others to the true religion, what were the apostles themselves, but the makers of proselytes? What did Jesus Christ give them to do, when he bade them "Go and teach all nations," (Matt. xxviii. 19,) but every where to make proselytes? For what were the apostles persecuted, put to death, and crowned with the glory of martyrdom, but for making proselytes? What successor of the apostles would do his duty, if he did not labour like them to make proselytes? What Christian could lay claim to the rewards of charity, who, convinced of the truth of his religion, and of the inestimable blessings it imparts, refused or neglected to make others partakers of it; concealed his treasure from the objects of distress, and covered "under a bushel," the light which was wanted to guide the steps of his benighted fellow-traveller?

But, if by proselytism is meant the seducing of men from truth to error, or what we believe to be such; if it imply the use of any means that are unfair, unhandsome, dishonourable, or uncharitable; of violence, bribery, false arguments or any other means whatsoever than such as are dictated by the strictest truth and animated by pure benevolence; then, indeed, is proselytism as odious as it is unchristian; then, far be its practice from every Catholic and from every Christian. Be it hated and detested by every lover of honesty, of truth, and of charity.

THE POPE.

Catholics, while they hold that the Church is the congregation of all the faithful under their invisible head, Jesus Christ, also believe that the Church has a visible head, in the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, and commonly called the Pope. That Jesus Christ, in quality of *our Lord*, is the head of the Church, will not be disputed; for "God appointed him head over all the Church." (Eph. i. 22.) But, since his ascent into heaven, he is invisible to us; and the question is, whether he did not, before he left the earth, appoint a vicar, or deputy, to be the visible head in his place. From Scripture it is manifest that he did, and that St. Peter was the person on whom he conferred this high dignity. The following circumstances are worthy of attention. The name of this apostle was originally Simon. The moment he appeared before our Saviour, he received from him a new name: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas." (John i. 42.) Now, why did our blessed Lord give

to Simon, at first sight, before he had said or done any thing to elicit it, this name of *Cephas*, which signifies *rock*? In due season, the mystery was disclosed, when, in consequence of Peter's confession, Christ said to him, "Thou art Cephas, and on this cephas I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi. 18); words, in Hebrew, equivalent to the following: "Thou art Rock, the rock on which I will build my church." He then proceeded thus: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." (Ibid. 19.) The power of binding and loosing was afterwards conferred on the other apostles, but not the keys, the badge of the chief officer in the household. They were granted to Peter alone. Other circumstances will be noted by those who are desirous to ascertain the bearing and signification of the Saviour's actions. For instance, in the miraculous draught of fishes, which was figurative of the gathering of the nations into the church, when Peter, with his associates James and John, forsook all, and followed our Saviour, it will be remarked that it was the bark of Peter into which Jesus entered in preference; it was Peter whom he ordered to let down the net for a draught, and to Peter that he said, "Fear not; henceforth thou shalt catch men;" that is, shalt be a fisher of men. (Luke v. 10.) From that period, we always find Peter spoken of as the first, and the leader of the others; to him is given the charge that he confirm his brethren, (Luke xxii. 32,) and the office of feeding both the lambs and the sheep, (John xxi. 15, 16,) which is interpreted by the fathers as the simple faithful, and their spiritual guides. After the ascension of our Lord, we find him acting as the head of the whole body, at the election of Matthias (Acts i.); in preaching the gospel to the Jews (Acts ii. 3); in rebuking Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v.); in the calling of the gentiles (Acts x.); and in the council at Jerusalem, (Acts xv.) All these passages and proceedings demonstrate in Peter a pre-eminence in rank and authority above the other apostles.

Should it be supposed that the office might be personal to Peter, and therefore might not pass to his successors, it is not unreasonable to ask on what ground such a supposition rests? If Christ, when he established his church, gave to it a visible head, who could have authority to change that form of government afterwards? Whatever reason there might be why Peter should be invested with authority over his brethren, the other apostles; the same reason will require that the successor of Peter should be invested with authority over

his brethren, the successors of those apostles. To seek for proof from Scripture on points like these, would be labour lost, because the Scripture does not treat of them. We may glean from the inspired writers a few detached and imperfect notices of the form of church government which was established in their time; but not one of them fully describes that form, nor alludes to the form that was to prevail in time to come. For such matters we must have recourse to tradition; and tradition bears ample testimony to the superior authority of the successors of St. Peter. St. Irenæus says (*anno 177*), "It is necessary that all the Church—that is, the faithful, wherever they are,—should conform to" (be in communion with) "the Church of Rome, on account of her superior chiefdom."—*Adv. Hær.* iii. 3. Tertullian says (*anno 194*), "If thou think that heaven is still closed, recollect that the Lord left the keys thereof to Peter, and through him to the Church."—*Scorpiaci*, c. x.

With respect to certain questions agitated in the schools, relative to the spiritual power of the Pope, as exercised in conjunction with the temporal, little need be said in this place; although we see such questions continually revived, in order to draw down odium upon the Catholics. Suffice it to state, that these questions are not included in the articles of Catholic faith, nor have any influence upon Catholic practice. On this point, we have pleasure in quoting the decisive words of Dr. Purcell, Bishop of Cincinnati: "The Catholics do not believe that the Pope has any such power [that of interfering with the institutions of free States]. We would be among the first to oppose him in its exercise, and we should be neither heretics nor bad Catholics for so doing. For ten centuries this power was never claimed by any Pope; it can, therefore, be no part of Catholic doctrine. It has not gained one foot of land for the Pope. It is not anywhere believed or acted upon, in the Catholic Church; nor could it at this late day be established, even were a man found mad enough to make the attempt. Let these go forth before the American people as the real principles of Catholics concerning the power of the Pope. And if we must pronounce a judgment on the past, let it be remembered, that when the Pope did use the power, it was *when he was appealed to* as a common father, and in favour of the oppressed. We should go back, in spirit, to former times, when we undertake to judge them. We should understand the condition of society at the period; we should know the circumstances, general and particular, which controlled or influenced the great events recorded in history. We should not quarrel with our ancestors, because they did not

possess knowledge which we possess ; nor flatter ourselves that we are vastly their betters, because of these adventitious advantages ; while they manifestly surpass us in others, of greater value to the Christian and the moralist. They had the substance of good things ; we seem to be content with the shadow of them."

The same sentiments are eloquently enforced by Judge Hall, of Cincinnati. We quote a paragraph or two, for the benefit of those who may not be acquainted with an address, honourable alike to the head and the heart of its candid and liberal author.

"This question [the alarm raised against the Catholics] has become so important in the United States, that it is time to begin to inquire into its bearings, and to know whether the public are really interested in the excitement which has been gotten up with unusual industry, and has been kept alive with a pertinacity that has seldom been equalled. For several years past the religious Protestant papers of our country, with but few exceptions, have teemed with virulent attacks against the Catholics, and especially with paragraphs charging them substantially with designs hostile to our free institutions, and with a systematic opposition to the spread of all free inquiry and liberal knowledge. These are grave charges, involving consequences of serious import, and such as should not be believed or disbelieved upon mere rumour, or permitted to rest upon any vague hypothesis ; because they are of a nature which renders them susceptible of proof. The spirit of our institutions requires that these questions should be thus examined. We profess to guarantee to every inhabitant of our country, certain rights, in the enjoyment of which he shall not be molested, except through the instrumentality of a process of law which is clearly indicated. Life, liberty, property, reputation, are thus guarded—and equally sacred is the right secured to every man, to 'worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.'

"But it is idle to talk of these inestimable rights, as having any efficacious existence, if the various checks and sanctions, thrown around them by our constitution and laws, may be evaded, and a lawless majority, with a high hand, ravish them by force from a few individuals, who may be effectually outlawed by a perverted public opinion, produced by calumny and clamour. It is worse than idle, it is wicked, to talk of liberty, while a majority, having no other right than that of the strongest, persist in blasting the character of unoffending individuals by calumny, and in oppressing them by direct violence upon their persons and property, not only without evidence of their

delinquency, but against evidence; not only without law, but in violation of law—and merely because they belong to an unpopular denomination.

“The very fact that the Roman Catholics are, and can be with impunity, thus trampled upon, in a country like ours, affords in itself the most conclusive evidence of the groundlessness of the fears which are entertained by some respecting them. Without the power to protect themselves in the enjoyment of the ordinary rights of citizenship, and with a current of prejudice setting so strongly against them, that they find safety only in bending meekly to the storm; how idle, how puerile, how disingenuous is it, to rave as some have done, of the danger of Catholic influence!

“We repeat, that this is a question which must rest upon testimony. The American people are too intelligent, too just, too magnanimous, to suffer the temporary delusion by which so many have been blinded, to settle down into a permanent national prejudice, and to oppress one Christian denomination at the bidding of others, without some proof, or some reasonable argument.

“We have not yet seen any evidence in the various publications that have reached us, of any unfairness on the part of the Catholics, in the propagation of their religious doctrines. If they are active, persevering, and ingenious, in their attempts to gain converts, and if they are successful in securing the countenance and support of those who maintain the same form of belief in other countries, these, we imagine, are the legitimate proofs of Christian zeal and sincerity. In relation to Protestant sects, they are certainly so estimated; and we are yet to learn, why the ordinary laws of evidence are to be set aside in reference to this denomination, and why the missionary spirit which is so praiseworthy in others, should be thought so wicked and so dangerous in them.

“Let us inquire into this matter calmly. Why is it that the Catholics are pursued with such pertinacity, with such vindictiveness, with such ruthless malevolence? Why cannot their peculiar opinions be opposed by argument, by persuasion, by remonstrance, as one Christian sect should oppose each other? We speak kindly of the Jew, and even of the heathen; there are those that love a negro or a Cherokee even better than their own flesh and blood; but a Catholic is an abomination, for whom there is no law, no charity, no bond of Christian fraternity.

“These reflections rise naturally out of the recent proceedings in relation to the Roman Catholics. A nunnery has been demolished by an infuriated mob—a small community of refined and unprotected

females, lawfully and usefully engaged in the tuition of children, whose parents have voluntarily committed them to their care, have been driven from their home—yet the perpetrators have escaped punishment, and the act, if not openly excused, is winked at, by Protestant Christians. The outrage was public, extensive, and undeniable; and a most respectable committee, who investigated all the facts, have shown that it was unprovoked—a mere wanton ebullition of savage malignity. Yet the sympathies of a large portion of the Protestant community are untouched.

“Is another instance required, of the pervading character of this prejudice? How common has been the expedient, employed by missionaries from the west, in the eastern states, of raising money for education or for religion upon the allegation that it was necessary to prevent the ascendancy of the Catholics! How often has it been asserted, throughout the last ten years, that this was the chosen field on which the papists had erected their standard, and where the battle must be fought for civil and religious liberty! What tales of horror have been poured into the ears of the confiding children of the Pilgrims—of young men emigrating to the west, marrying Catholic ladies, and collapsing without a struggle into the arms of Romanism—of splendid edifices undermined by profound dungeons, prepared for the reception of heretic republicans—of boxes of firearms secretly transported into hidden receptacles, in the very bosoms of our flourishing cities—of vast and widely ramified European conspiracies, by which Irish Catholics are suddenly converted into lovers of monarchy, and obedient instruments of kings!

“A prejudice so indomitable and so blind, could not fail, in an ingenious and enterprising land like ours, to be made the subject of pecuniary speculation; accordingly we find such works as the ‘Master Key to Popery,’ ‘Secrets of Female Convents,’ and ‘Six Months in a Convent,’ manufactured with a distinct view to making a profit out of this diseased state of the public mind. The abuse of the Catholics, therefore, is not merely matter of party rancour, but is a regular trade; and the compilation of anti-catholic books of the character alluded to, has become a part of the regular industry of the country, as much as the making of nutmegs, or the construction of clocks.

“Philosophy sanctions the belief, that power, held by any set of men without restraint or competition, is liable to abuse; and history teaches the humiliating fact, that power thus held has always been abused. To inquire who has been the greatest aggressor against the rights of human nature, when all who have been tempted have

evinced a common propensity to trample upon the laws of justice and benevolence, would be an unprofitable procedure. The reformers punished heresy by death as well as the Catholics; and the murders perpetrated by intolerance, in the reign of Elizabeth, were not less atrocious than those which occurred under 'the bloody Mary.' We might even come nearer home, and point to colonies on our own continent, planted by men professing to have fled from religious persecution, who not only excluded from all civil and political rights those who were separated from them by only slight shades of religious belief, but persecuted many even to death, for heresy and witchcraft. Yet these things are not taken into the calculation; and Catholics are assumed, without examination, to be exclusively and especially prone to the sins of oppression and cruelty.

"The French Catholics, at a very early period, commenced a system of missions for the conversion of the Indians, and were remarkably successful in gaining converts, and conciliating the confidence and affections of the tribes. While the Pequods and other northern tribes were becoming exterminated, or sold into slavery, the more fortunate savage of the Mississippi was listening to the pious counsels of the Catholic missionary. This is another fact, which deserves to be remembered, and which should be weighed in the examination of the testimony. It shows that the Catholic appetite for cruelty is not quite so keen as is usually imagined; and that they exercised, of choice, an expansive benevolence, at a period when Protestants, similarly situated, were bloodthirsty and rapacious.

"Advancing a little further in point of time, we find a number of colonies advancing rapidly towards prosperity, on our Atlantic seaboard. In point of civil government they were somewhat detached, each making its own municipal laws, and there being in each a predominance of the influence of one religious denomination. We might therefore expect to see the political bias of each sect carried out into practice; and it is curious to examine how far such was the fact. It is the more curious, because the writers and orators of one branch of this family of republics, are in the habit of attributing to their own fathers the principles of religious and political toleration, which became established throughout the whole, and are now the boast and pride of our nation. The impartial record of history affords on this subject a proof alike honourable to all, but which rebukes alike the sectional or sectarian vanity of each. New England was settled by English Puritans, New York by Dutch Protestants, Pennsylvania by Quakers, Maryland by Catholics, Virginia by the Episcopalian adherents of the Stuarts, and South Carolina by a mingled population of

Roundheads and Cavaliers from England, and of French Huguenots—yet the same broad foundations of civil and political liberty were laid simultaneously in them all, and the same spirit of resistance animated each community, when the oppressions of the mother country became intolerable. Religious intolerance prevailed in early times only in the eastern colonies; but the witchcraft superstition, though most strongly developed there, pervaded some other portions of the new settlements. We shall not amplify our remarks on this topic; it is enough to say, that if the love of monarchy was a component principle of the Catholic faith, it was not developed in our country when a fair opportunity was offered for its exercise; and that in the glorious struggle for liberty, for civil and religious emancipation—when our fathers arrayed themselves in defence of the sacred principles involving the whole broad ground of contest between liberty and despotism, the Catholic and the Protestant stood side by side on the battle-field, and in the council, and pledged to their common country, with equal devotedness, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honour. Nor should it be forgotten, that in a conflict thus peculiarly marked, a Catholic king was our ally, when the most powerful of Protestant governments was our enemy.”

We close, in the language of the great father of American liberty. In a reply to a patriotic address of the Catholics of the United States, the illustrious Washington thus gave utterance to his feelings:

“Gentlemen,—While I now receive with much satisfaction your congratulations on my being called by an unanimous vote, to the first station in my country, I cannot but duly notice your politeness, in offering an apology for the unavoidable delay. As that delay has given you an opportunity of realizing, instead of anticipating, the benefits of the general government, you will do me the justice to believe, that your testimony of the increase of the public prosperity, enhances the pleasure, which I should otherwise have experienced from your affectionate address.

“I feel that my conduct, in war and in peace, has met with more general approbation than could have reasonably been expected; and I find myself disposed to consider that fortunate circumstance, in a great degree, resulting from the able support, and extraordinary candour, of my fellow-citizens of all denominations.

“The prospect of national prosperity now before us, is truly animating, and ought to excite the exertions of all good men, to establish and secure the happiness of their country, in the permanent duration of its freedom and independence. America, under the smiles of divine Providence, the protection of a good government, and the cul-

tivation of manners, morals, and piety, cannot fail of attaining an uncommon degree of eminence in literature, commerce, agriculture, improvements at home, and respectability abroad.

“As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow, that *all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community, are equally entitled to the protection of civil government.* I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens *will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their government,* or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed.

“I thank you, gentlemen, for your kind concern for me. While my life and my health shall continue, in whatever situation I may be, it shall be my constant endeavour to justify the favourable sentiments which you are pleased to express of my conduct. And may the members of your society in America, animated alone by the pure spirit of Christianity, and still conducting themselves as the faithful subjects of our government, enjoy every temporal and spiritual felicity.”

CHRISTIANS, OR CHRISTIAN CONNEXION.

BY THE REV. DAVID MILLARD,

AUTHOR OF TRAVELS IN EGYPT, ARABIA PETREA, AND THE HOLY LAND.

WITHIN about one half century, a very considerable body of religionists have arisen in the United States, who, rejecting all names, appellations, and badges of distinctive party among the followers of Christ, simply call themselves CHRISTIANS. Sometimes, in speaking of themselves as a body, they use the term *Christian Connexion*. In many parts of our country this people have become numerous; and as their origin and progress have been marked with some rather singular coincidents, this article will present a few of them in brief detail.

Most of the Protestant sects owe their origin to some individual reformer, such as a Luther, a Calvin, a Fox, or a Wesley. The Christians never had any such leader, nor do they owe their origin to the labours of any one man. They rose nearly simultaneously in different sections of our country, remote from each other, without any preconcerted plan, or even knowledge of each other's movements. After the lapse of several years, the three branches obtained some information of each other, and upon opening a correspondence, were surprised to find that all had embraced nearly the same principles, and were engaged in carrying forward the same system of reform. This singular coincidence is regarded by them as evidence that they are a people raised up by the immediate direction and overruling providence of God; and that the ground they have assumed is the one which will finally swallow up all party distinctions in the gospel church.

While the American Revolution hurled a deathblow at political domination, it also diffused a spirit of liberty into the church. The Methodists had spread to some considerable extent in the United States, especially south of the Potomac. Previous to this time they had been considered a branch of the Church of England, and were dependent on English Episcopacy for the regular administration of the ordinances. But as the revolution had wrested the states from

British control, it also left the American Methodists free to transact their own affairs. Thomas Coke, Francis Asbury, and others, set about establishing an Episcopal form of church government for the Methodists in America. Some of the preachers, however, had drank too deeply of the spirit of the times to tamely submit to lordly power, whether in judicial vestments, or clad in the gown of a prelate. Their form of church government became a subject of spirited discussion in several successive conferences. James O'Kelly, of North Carolina, and several other preachers of that state and of Virginia, plead for a *congregational* system, and that the New Testament be their only creed and discipline. The weight of influence, however, turned on the side of Episcopacy and a human creed. Francis Asbury was elected and ordained bishop; Mr. O'Kelly, several other preachers, and a large number of brethren, seceding from the dominant party. This final separation from the Episcopal Methodists, took place, voluntarily, at Manakin Town, N. C., December 25th, 1793. At first they took the name of "Republican Methodists," but at a subsequent conference resolved to be known as Christians only, to acknowledge no head over the church but Christ, and no creed or discipline but the Bible.

Near the close of the 18th century, Dr. Abner Jones, of Hartland, Vermont, then a member of a regular Baptist Church, had a peculiar travel of mind in relation to sectarian names and human creeds. The first, he regarded as an evil, because they were so many badges of distinct separation among the followers of Christ. The second, served as so many lines or walls of separation to keep the disciples of Christ apart; that sectarian names and human creeds should be abandoned, and that true piety alone, and not the externals of it, should be made the only test of Christian fellowship and communion. Making the Bible the only source from whence he drew the doctrine he taught, Dr. Jones commenced propagating his sentiments with zeal, though at that time he did not know of another individual who thought like himself. In September, 1800, he had the pleasure of seeing a church of about twenty-five members gathered in Lyndon, Vt., embracing these principles. In 1802 he gathered another church in Bradford, Vt., and, in March, 1803, another in Piermont, N. H. About this time, Elias Smith, then a Baptist minister, was preaching with great success in Portsmouth, N. H. Falling in with Dr. Jones's views, the church under his care was led into the same principles. Up to this time Dr. Jones had laboured as a preacher nearly if not quite single-handed; but several preachers from the regular Baptists and Freewill Baptists, now rallied to the standard he had unfurled. Preachers

were also raised up in the different churches now organized, several of whom travelled extensively, preaching with great zeal and success. Churches of the order were soon planted in all the New England states, the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and more recently in New Jersey and Michigan. A large number of churches have also been planted in the Canadas, and the province of New Brunswick.

A very extraordinary revival of religion was experienced among the Presbyterians in Kentucky and Tennessee, during the years 1800 and 1801. Several Presbyterian ministers heartily entered into this work, and laboured with a fervour and zeal which they had never before manifested. Others either stood aloof from it, or opposed its progress. The preachers who entered the work, broke loose from the shackles of a Calvinistic creed, and preached the gospel of free salvation. The creed of the church now appeared in jeopardy. Presbyteries, and finally the Synod of Kentucky, interposed their authority to stop what they were pleased to call a torrent of Arminianism. Barton W. Stone, of Kentucky, a learned and eloquent minister, with four other ministers, withdrew from the Synod of Kentucky. As well might be expected, a large number of Presbyterian members, with most of the converts in this great revival, rallied round these men who had laboured so faithfully, and had been so signally blessed in their labours. As they had already felt the scourge of a human creed, the churches then under their control, with such others as they organized, agreed to take the Holy Scriptures as their only written rule of faith and practice. At first they organized themselves into what was called the "Springfield Presbytery;" but in 1803, they abandoned that name, and agreed to be known as Christians only. Preachers were now added to their numbers and raised up in their ranks. As they had taken the scriptures for their guide, pedobaptism was renounced, and believers' baptism by immersion substituted in its room. On a certain occasion one minister baptized another minister, and then he who had been baptized immersed the others. From the very beginning, this branch spread with surprising rapidity, and now extends through all the western states.

From this brief sketch it will be perceived that this people originated from the three principal Protestant sects in America. The branch at the south, from the Methodists; the one at the north, from the Baptists, and the one at the west, from the Presbyterians. The three branches rose within the space of eight years, in sections remote and unknown to each other, until some years afterwards. Probably no other religious body ever had a similar origin.

The adopting of the Holy Scriptures as their only system of faith,

has led them to the study of shaping their belief by the language of the sacred oracles. A doctrine, which cannot be expressed in the language of inspiration, they do not hold themselves obligated to believe. Hence, with very few exceptions, they are not Trinitarians, averring that they can neither find the word nor the doctrine in the Bible. They believe "the Lord our Jehovah is *one* Lord," and purely *one*. That "Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God." That the Holy Ghost is that divine unction with which our Saviour was anointed, (Acts x. 38,) the effusion that was poured out on the day of Pentecost; and that it is a divine emanation of God, by which he exerts an energy or influence on rational minds. While they believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, they are not Socinians or Humanitarians. Their prevailing belief is that Jesus Christ existed with the Father before all worlds. (See Millard's "True Messiah," Morgridge's "True Believer's Defence," and Kinkade's "Bible Doctrine.")

Although the Christians do not contend for entire uniformity in belief, yet in addition to the foregoing, nearly, if not quite all of them would agree in the following sentiments: 1. That God is the rightful arbiter of the universe; the source and fountain of all good. 2. That all men have sinned and come short of the glory of God. 3. That with God there is forgiveness; but that sincere repentance and reformation are indispensable to the forgiveness of sins. 4. That man is constituted a free moral agent, and made capable of obeying the gospel. 5. That through the agency of the Holy Spirit souls, in the use of means, are converted, regenerated and made new creatures. 6. That Christ was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification; that through his example, doctrine, death, resurrection and intercession, he has made salvation possible to every one, and is the only Saviour of lost sinners. 7. That baptism and the Lord's supper are ordinances to be observed by all true believers; and that baptism is the immersing of the candidate in water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 8. That a life of watchfulness and prayer only will keep Christians from falling, enable them to live in a justified state, and ultimately secure to them the crown of eternal life. 9. That there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust. 10. That God has ordained Jesus Christ judge of the quick and dead at the last day; and at the judgment, the wicked will go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal.

In the Christian Connexion, churches are independent bodies, authorized to govern themselves and transact their own affairs. They have a large number of associations called Conferences. Each con-

ference meets annually, sometimes oftener, and is composed of ministers and messengers from churches within its bounds. At such conferences candidates for the ministry are examined, received and commended. Once a year, in conference, the character and standing of each minister is examined, that purity in the ministry may be carefully maintained. Such other subjects are discussed and measures adopted, as have a direct bearing on the welfare of the body at large.

They have a book concern located at Union Mills, N. Y., called "The Christian General Book Association." At the same place they issue a semi-monthly periodical called the "Christian Palladium." They also publish a weekly paper at Exeter, N. H., called the "Christian Herald;" and another semi-monthly periodical is about to be issued in the state of Ohio, to be called the "Gospel Herald." They have also three institutions of learning; one located at Durham, N. H., one in North Carolina, and the other at Starkey, Yates county, N. Y.

Although several of their preachers are defective in education, yet there are among them some good scholars and eloquent speakers; several of whom have distinguished themselves as writers. Education is fast rising in their body. While their motto has ever been, "Let him that understands the gospel, teach it," they are also convinced that Christianity never has been, and never will be indebted to palpable ignorance. Their sermons are most generally delivered extempore, and energy and zeal are considered important traits in a minister for usefulness.

The statistics of the connexion, though imperfect, may probably be computed, at the present time, (1844,) as follows: the number of preachers about 1500, and 500 licentiates; communicants about 325,000; number of churches about 1500. There are probably not less than 500,000 persons in this country who have adopted their general views, and attend upon their ministry.

CHURCH OF GOD.

BY REV. JOHN WINEBRENNER, V. D. M.,
HARRISBURG, PA.

"Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."
REV. xiv. 12.

THE prominent parts and aspects of this article on the "Church of God," may be traced and referred to under the following heads, to wit:

- 1st. *The origin and name;*
- 2dly. *The form and attributes;*
- 3dly. *The faith and practice; and,*
- 4thly. *The economy and statistics, of the Church of God.*

We shall give a brief account of

I. THE ORIGIN AND NAME OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.

a. As to the origin of the Church of God, truth compels us to say, that she justly claims priority to all evangelical churches. Her illustrious and adorable founder is the Lord Jesus Christ. He bought her with his blood.* He founded her on the Rock.† He first commenced her gathering.‡ He continued her establishment by the ministry of the apostles,§ and by the dispensations of his Spirit. And thus he still continues to carry on this building of God||—this New Jerusalem from above, which is the mother of us all.¶ And we may add, this, his own church or temple, he will thus continue to build and prosper, despite of all her adversaries; and ultimately, at the end of time, consummate, by bringing forth the head stones thereof with loud acclamations and shouts of grace, grace to it.**

* Acts xx. 28.

† Matt. xvi. 18.

‡ Mark i. 14-20.

§ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi.; Acts ii. 1.

|| 1 Cor. iii. 9.

¶ Gal. iv. 26.

** Zech. iv. 7.

Some writers have sought to trace the origin of the Church of God up to Abraham, the father of the faithful. But this is an error. If the Church of God under the New Testament was the same with the Abrahamic or Jewish Church, then Christ would never have said to Peter, "Upon this rock will I build my Church;"* and the Apostle would never have said, "He (Christ) hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain (Jews and gentiles) one new man."† Now, if this "new man," means the Church of God, and of this there can be no rational doubt, then, without controversy, she originated under the personal ministry of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

b. The name or title, Church of God, is undeniably the true and proper appellation by which the New Testament church ought to be designated. This is her scriptural and appropriate name. This, and no other title, is given her by divine authority.‡ This name or title, therefore, ought to be adopted and worn to the exclusion of all others.

There are those, who have pleaded for the use, and for the exclusive use, of some other appellations: such as the name of Christian; others for that of Disciples; and others, again, for the name Brethren, &c. But it ought to be recollected, that not one of these is a proper noun, or a patronymic, and, therefore, none of them is ever used in Scripture as an appellation for the church. The individual members of the church are, and may be, very properly so called; but not so with regard to the church herself. We nowhere read of the "Christian Church," or of the "Disciples' Church," nor of the "Brethren's Church," &c.

If, then, it is unscriptural to assume and wear any one of these, or any other Bible name, as a church appellation, how much more improper, unscriptural, and God-dishonouring is it, to lay aside all Bible names, even the divinely appointed name, Church of God, and assume a human name: such as Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Presbyterian, German Reformed, Baptist, Methodist, Menonist, Unitarian, Universalist, or something else, equally inappropriate, unscriptural, or even unmeaning?

As a religious community, therefore, we claim to stand identified with, and to be a part of, the true Church of God.§ As such, we claim

* Matt. xvi. 18.

† Eph. ii. 14, 15.

‡ Is. lxii. 2; Acts xx. 28; Gal. i. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 15

§ We admit, there are more or less Christians, or converted persons, among the different sects and denominations; but we regret that the most of them have no preference

brotherhood with all the saints of God, wherever they may be found, and wish to extend the hand of fellowship to all, without exception, "whose fellowship is with the Father and his Son the Lord Jesus Christ."

But as I have been requested to write a brief history of the Church of God, as she exists by that name in the United States, I shall here give a short account of the origin and progress of that religious community, or body of believers, who profess to have come out from all human and unscriptural organizations, and to have fallen back upon original grounds, and who wish, therefore, to be known and called by no other distinctive name, collectively taken, than the CHURCH OF GOD. This name we assume from conscientious motives, because reason and revelation require it; and not because we wish to magnify ourselves against others, as it has been improperly and unkindly intimated by some of our sectarian neighbours.

In the year 1820 the writer of this article settled in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as a minister of the German Reformed Church, and took charge of *four* congregations; *one* in town, and *three* in the country. Soon after his settlement in this charge, it pleased the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls to commence a work of grace among the people, both in town and in the country. But, as revivals of religion were new and almost unheard-of things in those days, especially among the German people of that region, this work of God failed not to excite great wrath and opposition among hypocrites, false professors, and the wicked generally; just as true revivals of religion, or genuine works of grace, have very generally, if not always done. And as the members of the aforesaid congregations or churches so called, were themselves unconverted, with few exceptions, and ignorant of the right ways of the Lord, the most violent opposition and persecution arose from that quarter, aided by not a few of the ministers of their synod themselves. This state of things lasted for the space of about five years, and then resulted in a separation from the German Reformed Church.

About this time (1825) more extensive and glorious revivals of religion commenced in different towns and neighbourhoods, to wit: Harrisburg, Shiremanstown, Lisborn, Mechanicsburg, Churchtown, New Cumberland, Linglestown, Middletown, Millerstown, Lebanon, Lancaster, Shippensburg, Elizabethtown, Mount Joy, Marietta, and various other places. In these glorious revivals there were hundreds

for Bible names, and the right ways of the Lord; or, if they have, that they lack moral courage to avow it.

and multitudes happily converted to God. The conversion of these scores and multitudes in different places led to the organization of churches. And, as the writer's views had by this time materially changed, as to the true nature of a scriptural organization of churches, he adopted the apostolic plan, as taught in the New Testament, and established spiritual, free, and independent churches, consisting of believers or Christians only, without any human name, or creed, or ordinances, or laws, &c.

From among these young converts, in these newly planted churches, it pleased God to raise up several able men, to take upon them the solemn and responsible office of the gospel ministry. These ministering brethren, with a few other great and good men with similar views and kindred spirits, laboured and co-operated with each other for a few years, promiscuously, as it were, or without any regular system of co-operation; but finally they agreed to hold a meeting for the purpose of adopting a regular system of co-operation.

Accordingly, they met together for this purpose, pursuant to public notice, in the Union Bethel, at Harrisburg, in the month of October, 1830, and organized the meeting by appointing John Winebrenner, of Harrisburg, speaker; and John Elliott, of Lancaster, clerk.

After spending the morning session in solemn prayer and deliberations, the meeting was adjourned till 2 o'clock, P. M., when a sermon was preached before the meeting by the speaker, of which the following is a brief sketch.

Text—"And now, I say to you, refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." (Acts, v. 38, 39.)

By the "counsel and work" spoken of in this passage is meant the preaching and propagation of Christianity, or, in other words, the conversion of sinners, the formation of churches, and the supply of the destitute with the gospel ministry.

The furtherance of this counsel and work, then, is the great ostensible object contemplated by the present meeting; that is, by adopting such a plan of co-operation as shall most happily subserve the cause of God in promoting

1st. The conversion of sinners;

2dly. The establishment of churches upon the New Testament plan; and,

3dly. The supplying of the destitute with the preaching of the gospel.

First. The conversion of sinners is the first great aim, end or object contemplated by the preaching of the gospel.

By sinners, we mean persons in a carnal or natural state, and who have transgressed the law of God.

By the conversion of sinners, we mean such a moral change of the heart and life, as the Scriptures uniformly require and declare indispensably necessary to prepare them for heaven.

This great and benevolent end is usually effected by the preaching of the gospel. Hence Christ has ordained the ministry of the gospel. And those who are entrusted with this sacred office, ought to consider it their first and great duty to labour for the conversion of sinners. This is the first part of the "counsel and work of God." This, therefore, we have in view: *of it* may we never lose sight, and *in it* may we never tire.

Secondly. To establish and build up churches on the New Testament plan is another primary part of this "counsel and work;" and a further end or object that we have in view.

A church signifies a religious society, or a given number of Christians united together by mutual consent, for the worship of God according to the Scriptures.

Agreeably to the New Testament, churches should be formed,—

1. Of Christians or believers only ;*
2. Without a sectarian or human name ;†
3. With no creed and^d discipline but the Bible ;‡
4. Subject to no extrinsic or foreign jurisdiction ;§ and,
5. Governed by their own officers, chosen by a majority of the members of each individual church.||

To accomplish all this will require another great reformation. But, under God, it can be achieved.

Thirdly. To supply destitute places with regular preaching, is another great and necessary part of the "counsel and work" of God, and for the accomplishment of which we purpose to unite on the best and most efficient plan of co-operation.

With these, and many other words, the preacher testified, &c.

After sermon, the business meeting was called to order, and after some further consultation, it was agreed, as the unanimous sense of the meeting,

1st. That there is but one true church, namely: the Church of God.

2dly. That it is the bounden duty of all God's people to belong to her, and none else.

* Acts ii. 41; v. 13.

† Ps. xix. 7; Matt. xxviii. 20; Acts ii. 42; 2 John 9.

‡ Acts vi. 3; xx. 28.

† Is. lxii. 2.

§ Heb. xiii. 17; Gal. v. 1.

3dly. That it is "lawful and right" to associate together for the purpose of co-operation in the cause of God.

4thly. That we agree to hold an eldership annually for this purpose, consisting of teaching and ruling elders belonging to the Church of God.

The following teaching elders then subscribed their names, viz: Andrew Miller, John Winebrenner, John Elliott, John Walborn, David Maxwell and James Richards.

Thus originated the Church of God, properly so called, in the United States of America; and thus, also, originated the first eldership.

We shall now proceed to show, as was proposed,

II. THE FORM AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.

The Greek word *ἐκκλησία*, translated *church* in the New Testament, in its appropriate application to a religious use, signifies,

1st. A society of Christians, in some given place, who meet together for the worship of God according to the Scriptures. (Acts xiv. 23; Rev. i. 4.)

2dly. The whole body of true believers, collectively, throughout the world. (Matt. xvi. 18; 2 Cor. xii. 28; Gal. i. 13; Eph. v. 27.)

Accordingly, the saints, or body of believers, in any given place, constitute the Church of God in that place; whilst those different, local and individual churches, collectively taken, constitute the one, holy, catholic church of God, spread abroad throughout the world.

This, then, being the primary and appropriate use and meaning of the term *ἐκκλησία*, in the New Testament, it will be easy to perceive the true nature and form of the Church of God.

If she is constituted or made up of saints, Christians, or true believers, as the use of the word indicates, then such, and none else, are scripturally entitled to membership. And if she is a *society* of saints or Christians, then a congenial government is necessarily implied; for no society can well exist without order, and order supposes rule, discipline, and control; and these, a ruling and controlling power.

Organization, therefore, is fairly predicated of every gospel church. And we believe no church to be scripturally organized, without a competent number of bishops and deacons. These two classes are the only regular, standing church officers which Christ appointed. There were, besides these, several other officers in the primitive

church; but those were rather temporary, special, and extraordinary officers, than otherwise.

Bishops and elders (for these we hold to be convertible appellations, and designations of the same office, Acts xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5-7,) are the teaching and ruling officers of the church, in both her spiritual and secular departments; whilst the deacons are the servants and assistants of the elders in secular affairs.*

Hence we may readily and clearly perceive, that the form of government which God has ordained in his church is not and cannot be papal, nor patriarchal, nor magisterial, nor episcopal, in its popular sense, nor congregational; but PRESBYTERIAN, that is, a government vested in the hands of, and administered by, the elders or presbyters of the church.†

The proper way to organize or appoint the officers of a church is, to elect the ruling elders and deacons by a vote of the church, in which all the members, both males and females, ought to participate. (See Acts vi. 2, 3; Gal. iii. 28.) The *term* of office each church has a right to determine. But both reason and Scripture, we think, dictate the propriety of making these temporary, and not perpetual, or life-officers. If they are elected for a limited term, the church may displace them when she has it in her power to elect men of superior gifts and qualifications; and in the absence of that opportunity she loses nothing, because the same officers are always re-eligible.

Howbeit, teaching elders, or preachers of the gospel, ought always to be chosen or called of God; that is, moved, inclined, or disposed by the Holy Spirit, to take upon them the sacred functions of the gospel ministry. A divine call should always be antecedent to ecclesiastical ones.

The official functions and jurisdiction of ruling elders and deacons are restricted to the particular churches to which they belong; but the teaching elders, or preachers, carry with them all their ecclesiastical functions *ex-officio*.

This being the essential and organic form of the Church of God, to her rightfully appertain the following primary attributes, viz. :

1. Visibility.
2. Unity.
3. Sanctity.
4. Universality; and,
5. Perpetuity.

1st. Visibility is a prime attribute of the Church of God. God

* Acts vi. 1-5.

† Acts xx. 17-28.

intended his church to be "the light of the world,"* and this light to be "as clear as the sun and as fair as the moon."† Hence he compares her in another place to "a city that is set on a hill, and that cannot be hid."‡ An invisible church, therefore, that some divines speak of, is altogether an anomaly in Christian theology.

2dly. Unity is another essential attribute of the Church of God. The union of sects with the beast and false prophet, or into one human organization, diverse in character, faith, and practice from the one true Church of God, we have no belief in, nor sympathy for. But the oneness, or unity of all true believers, under the reign and government of Jesus Christ, is a consummation we most devoutly wish for; and it being founded on the immutable counsels of God, we believe implicitly, that here, under Messiah's reign, and in the Church of God, and nowhere else, is the proper rallying-ground, and the true platform of Christian union, where all can, will, and ought to meet and unite in order to be "*one*, perfectly *one*, as the Father and the Son are one." (See John xvii. 21, 22, 23; x. 16; Eph. ii. 14, 15.)

3dly. Sanctity is also an essential attribute of the true church. Hence none but saints, or holy ones, have a just and scriptural claim to membership in the Church of God. And as none can be holy out of Christ, that is, without a personal interest in him, none but sound converts and true believers ought to be recognised and tolerated as approved members in the church. The religious association of unconverted persons, or their incorporation with the "saints of the Most High," is directly subversive of the designs of God with regard to his church. (See John xvii. 14-19; Acts v. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 11-17; Eph. v. 26, 27; 1 Pet. i. 15, 16.)

4thly. Universality is likewise a prominent attribute in the Church of the First Born. A few passages will set this in a clear light. "The kingdom of heaven is like to leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." (Matt. xiii. 33.) "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." (Ps. lxxii. 8; Dan. ii. 34, 35.)

5thly. Perpetuity is another principal attribute of the true church. The Church of God is built upon an immovable rock, and "the gates of hell," we are told, "shall never prevail against her." This "kingdom," therefore, "is an everlasting kingdom." (See Matt. xvi. 18; Daniel iv. 3.)

Having thus briefly pointed out the form and attributes of the Church of God, I shall now proceed to show—

* Matt. v. 14.

† Songs vi. 10.

‡ Matt. v. 14.

III. THE FAITH AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.

The Church of God has no authoritative constitution, ritual, creed, catechism, book of discipline, or church standard, but the Bible. The Bible she believes to be the only creed, discipline, church standard, or test-book, which God ever intended his church to have. Nevertheless, it may not be inexpedient, *pro bono publico*, to exhibit a short manifesto, or declaration, showing her views, as to what may be called leading matters of faith, experience, and practice.

1. She believes the Bible, or the canonical books of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, a revelation from God to man, and the only authoritative rule of faith and practice. (See Luke xvi. 29, 31; 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 19-21.)

2. She believes in one Supreme God, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that these three are co-equal and co-eternal. (Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; 1 John v. 7.)

3. She believes in the fall and depravity of man; that is to say, that man by nature is destitute of the favour and image of God. (Rom. v. 10; viii. 7; iii. 10-13; 1 Cor. xv. 49; Col. i. 21.)

4. She believes in the redemption of man through the atonement, or vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ. (Rom. v. 6, 11; iii. 25; 2 Cor. v. 19-21; Gal. iii. 13; iv. 4, 5; Heb. ix. 12-15; 1 Peter iii. 18; 1 John ii. 2.)

5. She believes in the gift and office-work of the Holy Spirit; that is, in the enlightening, regenerating, and sanctifying influence and power of the Spirit. (John xvi. 7-11; xiv. 16, 17, 26; Acts i. 5; Titus iii. 5.)

6. She believes in the free, moral agency of man; that he has ability, because commanded, to repent and believe, in order to be saved; and that the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation, has no foundation in the oracles of God. (Matt. xxiii. 27; xxv. 14-30; John v. 40; Mark i. 15; Acts x. 43; xiii. 38, 39; xvii. 30; 1 John iii. 23.)

7. She believes that man is justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law, or by works of his own righteousness. (Rom. iii. 28; iv. 5, 6; Gal. ii. 16; Phil. iii. 9.)

8. She believes in the necessity of regeneration or the new birth; or, in the change of man's moral nature, after the image of God, by the influence and power of the word and spirit of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. (John iii. 5; Titus iii. 5-7; James i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23.)

9. She believes in three positive ordinances of perpetual standing

in the church, viz., *Baptism*, *Feet-washing*, and the *Lord's Supper*. (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16; John xiii. 4-17; 1 Cor. xi. 23-29; Matt. xxvi. 26-28.)

10. She believes two things essential to the validity of baptism, viz., *faith* and *immersion*: that faith should always precede immersion; and that where either is wanting, there can be no scriptural baptism. (Mark xvi. 16; Acts viii. 37; Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5; Col. ii. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 21.)

11. She believes that the ordinance of *feet-washing*, that is, the literal washing of the saints' feet, according to the words and example of Christ, is obligatory upon all Christians, and ought to be observed by all the churches of God. (John xiii. 4-17; Matt. xxviii. 20; 1 Tim. v. 10.)

12. She believes that the *Lord's Supper* should be often administered, and, to be consistent, to Christians only, in a sitting posture, and always in the evening. (Matt. xxvi. 26-28; 1 Cor. xi. 23-26; Luke xxii. 19, 20; Mark xiv. 22-25; Acts ii. 42.)

13. She believes in the institution of the Lord's day, or Christian sabbath, as a day of rest and religious worship. (Mark ii. 27; Luke xxiii. 56; Acts xiii. 27; Rev. i. 10.)

14. She believes that the reading and preaching of God's word, the singing of psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, and the offering up of prayers, are ordained of God, and ought to be regularly and devoutly observed by all the people and churches of God. (John v. 39; Matt. vi. 6-13; xxviii. 19, 20; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16; Phil. iv. 6.)

15. She believes in the propriety and utility of holding fast-days, experience meetings, anxious meetings, camp meetings, and other special meetings of united and protracted efforts for the edification of the church and the conversion of sinners. (1 Cor. xiv. 31; Luke vi. 12; Acts xi. 26; xii. 12; xiv. 27.)

16. She believes that the gospel ministry, sabbath schools, education, the religious press, the Bible, missionary, temperance, and all other benevolent causes, ought to be heartily and liberally supported. (1 Cor. ix. 11-14; Gal. vi. 6; James iv. 17.)

17. She believes that the church ought to relieve and take care of her own poor saints, superannuated ministers, widows and orphans. (Acts. vi. 1, 2; xi. 29; Rom. xii. 13; Gal. vi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 9; 1 Thess. v. 14; Phil. iv. 15; Heb. xiii. 16.)

18. She believes that the manufacture, traffic, and use of ardent spirits, as a beverage or common drink, is injurious and immoral, and ought to be abandoned. (1 Cor. x. 31; 1 Pet. ii. 11, 12; 1 Thess. v. 22.)

19. She believes the system or institution of involuntary slavery to be impolitic and unchristian. (Matt. vii. 12; xix. 19; Gal. iii. 28.)

20. She believes that all civil wars are unholy and sinful, and in which the saints of the Most High ought never to participate. (2 Cor. x. 4; Heb. xii. 14; Matt. vii. 12; xxvi. 52; v. 39, 44.)

21. She believes that civil governments are ordained of God for the general good; that Christians ought to be subject to the same in all things, except what is manifestly unscriptural; and that appeals to the law, out of the church, for justice, and the adjustments of civil rights, are not inconsistent with the principles and duties of the Christian religion. (Rom. xiii. 1-5; Acts xxv. 11, 21; 1 Cor. vi. 1-7.)

22. She believes in the necessity of a virtuous and holy life, and that Christ will save those only who obey them. (Heb. xii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 6; v. 9.)

23. She believes in the visibility, unity, sanctity, universality, and perpetuity of the church of God. (Matt. v. 14; John xvii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 17; Eph. v. 27; Matt. xiii. 33; xvi. 18.)

24. She believes in the personal coming and reign of Jesus Christ. (Matt. xxiv. 42-44; Acts i. 11; Phil. iii. 20, 21; 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 1 John iii. 2; Rev. i. 17.)

25. She believes in the resurrection of the dead, "both of the just and unjust;" that the resurrection of the just will precede the resurrection of the unjust; that the first will take place at the beginning, and the second at the end of the millennium. (John v. 28, 29; Acts xxiv. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 16; Rev. xx. 4, 5, 6.)

26. She believes in the creation of new heavens and a new earth. (Is. lxv. 17; lxvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1.)

27. She believes in the immortality of the soul; in a universal and eternal judgment; and in future and everlasting rewards and punishments. (Matt. xxv. 31-46; Mark viii. 36; xii. 25; Luke xvi. 19-31; Acts xvii. 31.)

Such then, is an outline of the avowed principles and practice of the Church of God in the United States. I shall now conclude this article by presenting—

IV. HER ECONOMY AND STATISTICS.

The economy of the ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ, is strictly scriptural and apostolical. All her local and individual churches are formed on the principles of a free and independent republic. After confederation and organization every particular church is under the supervision, watch-care, and government of an official church-council, consisting

of the preacher or preachers in charge, and a competent number of elders and deacons. These jointly co-operate in feeding, ruling, and governing the flock of God, on the rational principles of family government. These consist chiefly in these things, to wit :

“ In going before the people, and leading the several parts of their worship, and becoming their example in every duty. In teaching them the principles and rules of their religion ; the knowledge, profession, and practice of those doctrines and duties, that worship and order, which reason and natural religion dictate, and which Christ himself has revealed, superadded, and established in his Word. It consists in exhorting and persuading, and charging the members of the church with that seriousness, circumspection, and propriety of conduct, which becometh saints ; in instructing them how to apply those general principles and rules to particular cases and occurrences, and giving them their best advice under every circumstance. It consists in presiding in their assemblies for worship or otherwise ; in examining and admitting applicants for baptism and church-membership ; in watching over and guarding the church against errors and dangers. It consists in conducting the moral discipline of the church ; in admonishing, and warning, and reproving, with all gravity and authority, those who neglect or oppose any of the rules, ordinances, and commandments of Christ ; and expelling from the church the scandalous, and in receiving again the truly penitent.”*

These individual churches are confederated or united for co-operation. The Church of God, therefore, has within her bounds, at present, three Elderships, viz. : the East Pennsylvania, the Ohio, and the West Pennsylvania Elderships. Each Eldership holds an annual meeting, consisting of all the teaching elders within its bounds, and a delegation from the churches, or rather from the stations and circuits, of an equal number of ruling elders. Co-operation and not legislation is the main object of these meetings : and this is, on the itinerant and stationary plan, combined. Thus it was originally. Whilst some were stationed, others itinerated, in given districts ; whilst others again missionated, or travelled at large. This plan the Church of God finds to be the most rational, scriptural, and efficient, and therefore, she has adopted and pursues the same. Every station and circuit is required to support its own preacher or preachers for the time of their service among them, and to aid in supporting the preachers at large, &c.

The Church of God has one religious newspaper under her

* Vide “ Brief View of the Formation, Government, and Discipline of the Church of God,” by John Winebrenner, V. D. M.

patronage: "The Gospel Publisher," published at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Bishop George M'Cartney, editor.

STATISTICS.

In the East Pennsylvania Eldership there are at present:

Licensed and ordained ministers, - - - - -	50
Organized churches, - - - - -	70
Regular preaching places, about - - - - -	125
Probable number of church members, - - - - -	6000

In the Ohio Eldership there are:

Licensed and ordained ministers, - - - - -	23
Probable number of organized churches, - - - - -	35
Probable number of other appointments, - - - - -	85
Probable number of church members, - - - - -	3000

In the West Pennsylvania Eldership there are:

Licensed and ordained ministers, - - - - -	10
Probable number of churches, - - - - -	20
Probable number of regular preaching places, - - - - -	50
Probable number of church members, - - - - -	1000

RECAPITULATION.

Aggregate number of licensed and ordained ministers, - - -	83
Aggregate number of organized churches, - - - - -	125
Aggregate number of preaching places, - - - - -	260
Aggregate number of church members, - - - - -	10,000

CONGREGATIONALISTS.

BY THE REV. E. W. ANDREWS,

PASTOR OF THE BROADWAY TABERNACLE, NEW YORK.

THE origin of the Congregationalists, as a modern sect, is commonly ascribed to Robert Browne, who organized a church in England, in 1583. But it appears probable that there were churches formed upon congregational principles in the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Mary, although it is impossible to speak with any certainty respecting them. It is well known that Cranmer, the chief promoter of the Reformation in England, admitted the right of the churches to choose their own pastors, and the equality of the clergy; and it is worthy of note that, in the Bible published by him, the word *ecclesia* is always rendered congregation. Some of the bishops went further, and advanced opinions which would now be regarded as amongst the distinctive principles of the Congregationalists. But the right of any individual to judge for himself what the scriptures taught in matters of religion was not recognised. The government insisted upon an entire conformity to the established church, both in doctrines, and in rites and ceremonies. The Reformation advanced slowly; for its progress was controlled by subtle statesmen, who sought the reasons of any innovation, not in the word of God, but in the calculations of state policy. Many of the leading early reformers were greatly dissatisfied at the slow progress of the Reformation, and would gladly have introduced a more simple and scriptural form of worship. Even Edward VI., popular as he deservedly was with the Protestant party, did not escape censure for the indulgence he showed to Popish superstitions. It was evident in this reign, that a portion of the Protestants in England were far in advance of the standard set up by the king and the prelates; and that the distance between them was daily widening. But the dividing line between the supporters of the hierarchy and the non-conformists was not distinctly drawn, until the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity passed, in the early part of Elizabeth's reign. From this period, there was little hope of perma-

ment reconciliation between the two parties, although it was not until about the year 1565 that separate assemblies were held. It is from this time that the Puritans are to be regarded as a distinct party. The first open attempt to suppress these assemblies seems to have been made two years after, when a congregation was arrested at Plumbers' Hall, and thirty of them confined in Bridewell for more than a year.

Without enumerating all the points of difference between the prelates and the Puritans, it may perhaps be doubted whether an abrogation of all the rites and ceremonies complained of as superstitious, would not have allayed the storm that was rising against the Establishment, and prevented, for many years at least, the separation that afterwards took place. However this might have been, the attempt to enforce these ceremonies led the Puritans to examine more closely, than they had hitherto done, the ground of that authority so arbitrarily exercised over them. The dogmatic Cartwright assailed Episcopacy with great boldness, and asserted the Presbyterian to be the only scriptural form of church government. The cruelty and intolerance of the bishops had produced a directly opposite effect from what they had intended. Instead of coercing the nonconformists into submission, a spirit of resistance was aroused; and, as is well said by Hallam, "the battle was no longer to be fought for a tippet and a surplice, but for the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, interwoven as it was with the temporal constitution of England."

The first church formed upon Congregational principles, of whose existence we have any accurate knowledge, was that established by Robert Browne; but it was soon broken up, and Browne, with many of his congregation, fled to Holland. He subsequently returned to England, and is said by some historians to have renounced the principles he had so earnestly maintained. In the latter part of his life, he seems to have been openly immoral and dissolute. The church planted by him in Holland, after his departure, fell into dissensions, and soon perished. The character of Browne is thus drawn by Bancroft: "The most noisy advocate of the new system was Browne; a man of rashness, possessing neither true courage nor constancy; zealous, but fickle; dogmatical, but shallow. He has acquired historical notoriety, because his hot-headed indiscretion urged him to undertake the defence of separation. . . . The principles, of which the intrepid assertion had alone given him distinction, lay deeply rooted in the public mind; and as they did not draw life from his support, they did not suffer from his apostacy."

The opinions of Browne respecting church polity are the same in

many respects as those now held by the Congregationalists of New England. He maintained,* "that each church, or society of Christians meeting in one place, was a body corporate, having full power within itself to admit and exclude members; to choose and ordain officers; and when the good of the society required it, to depose them, without being accountable to classis, convocations, synods, councils, or any jurisdiction whatever." He denied the supremacy of the queen; and the claim of the Establishment to be a scriptural church. He declared the scriptures to be the only guide in all matters of faith and discipline. The labours of a pastor were to be confined to a single church, and beyond its bounds he possessed no authority to administer the ordinances. One church could exercise no jurisdiction over another, except so far as to advise or reprove it, or to withdraw its fellowship from such as walked disorderly. Five orders, or offices, were recognised in the church: those of pastor, teacher, elder, deacon, and widow; but he did not allow the priesthood to be a distinct order from the laity. How far these views have been since modified, will appear hereafter.

Such are the outlines of a system promulgated by Browne, in tracts published by him in 1680 and in 1682. The separating line, between the conforming and the non-conforming Puritans, now became broad and distinct. The former, recognising the Church of England as a true church, and unwilling to separate themselves from the Establishment, demanded only that her discipline should be further reformed, and her bishops ranked as the head of the presbyters. Neither by the supporters of the hierarchy, nor amongst this class of the Puritans, was the great doctrine of liberty of conscience recognised. A different standard of uniformity was indeed set up by each; but the principle of ecclesiastical tyranny was as plainly to be seen in the implicit obedience required to the decrees of synods, as in the oath of supremacy. The non-conforming Puritans would enter into no compromise with the Establishment. They desired its total overthrow, with all its cumbrous and complex machinery, its ceremonies and its forms; and to build upon its ruins churches after the simple, pure model of the apostolic days.

The first martyrs to these opinions were two clergymen, Thacker and Cokking, who were executed in 1583; ostensibly for denying the queen's supremacy, but in fact for dispersing Browne's tracts. Ten years afterward, Henry Barrow and John Greenwood were put to death for non-conformity. Barrow was somewhat distinguished by

* I abbreviate from Punchard's Hist. Cong. p. 247.

his publications in defence of his sentiments; and from him his followers were sometimes called Barrowists. Percy, an intimate friend of Barrow and Greenwood, was executed soon after.

In 1592 an act was passed, aimed at the separatists, by which it was enacted that whoever, over the age of sixteen, should refuse to attend upon common prayer in some church or chapel, for the space of one month, should be imprisoned, and if still refusing to conform, should be banished the realm. This law, cruel and oppressive as it was, was yet a relief to the separatists, who had long languished in prison, and who now, as banished exiles, might hope to find in other lands that religious freedom which was denied them in their own. How many left England at this time is unknown, most of those thus banished went to Holland; but even by the Dutch, who at that time understood and practised, far better than any other people, the principles of religious toleration, they were treated with little favour. The cause of this ill-reception seems to have been the slanders spread abroad respecting them by the English prelates, by which the Dutch were made to believe that they were factious, quarrelsome, and enemies to all forms of government. A better acquaintance soon removed these bad impressions, and churches were planted by the exiles in Amsterdam, Leyden, and several other cities, which continued to flourish more than a hundred years. In the discussion which took place in Parliament on the passage of this act, Sir Walter Raleigh estimated the number of Brownists in England at twenty thousand, a number, probably, short of the truth.

The separatists who remained in England were, in common with the great body of the Puritans, much more kindly treated, and allowed greater liberty of conscience during the last years of the queen's life. The prelates, ignorant of the religious opinions of James, her successor, were unwilling, by fresh acts of severity, to irritate and exasperate their non-conforming brethren. James had been educated in the Presbyterian faith, and the Puritans fondly hoped that, upon his accession to the throne, free permission would be given them to worship God as they pleased. But their hopes were bitterly disappointed. Won by the fulsome flatteries of the bishops, and made to believe that the demands of the Puritans were alike inconsistent with the preservation of the hierarchy, and the undisturbed exercise of the royal prerogatives, James was even more oppressive than his predecessor. At a convocation held in 1604, of which the bigoted Bancroft was president, new canons were drawn up, by which conformity was rigidly enforced. Excommunication, with all its civil penalties and disabilities, was pronounced against any one who should dare to deny the divine

authority of the established church, the perfect conformity of all its rites and ceremonies to the scriptures, or the lawfulness of its government; or who should separate from its communion, and assert that any other assembly or congregation was a true or lawful church. To these canons, by a royal proclamation, dated in July, 1604, all were required to conform; the Puritan ministers before the last day of November, "or else to dispose of themselves and families some other way." During this year between three and four hundred Puritan ministers were silenced or exiled, and for many years few summers passed by in which numbers did not seek safety in flight.

It is at this period that we first meet the name of John Robinson, who has, not inappropriately, been called the father of modern Congregationalism. Of his early life little is known. Probably he was at first a conforming Puritan. We first hear of him among the separatists, as the pastor of a church which had been formed in the north of England the year previous to Elizabeth's death. Harassed by the bishops, and seeing no prospect of peace at home, he and his congregation determined to leave their native land, and fly to Holland. But it was not without hazard and suffering that they were able to leave their own country behind them and escape. The first attempt was unsuccessful through the treachery of the captain of their vessel, who betrayed their plans to their enemies, and the whole company was imprisoned for a month. Upon the second attempt a part of the church reached Amsterdam in safety. Mr. Robinson and the remainder of the church, made another unsuccessful attempt, in the spring of 1608, which is thus graphically described by Bancroft: "An unfrequented heath in Lincolnshire was the place of secret meeting. As if it had been a crime to escape from persecution, the embarkation was to be made under the shelter of darkness. After having encountered a night storm, just as a boat was bearing a part of the emigrants to their ship, a company of horsemen appeared in pursuit, and seized upon the helpless women and children, who had not yet ventured on the surf. Painful it was to see the heavy case of these poor women in distress; what weeping and crying on every side. But when they were apprehended, it seemed impossible to punish and imprison wives and children, for no other crime than that they would go with their husbands and fathers. They could not be sent home, for they had no home to go to! so that, at last, the magistrates were 'glad to be rid of them on any terms,' 'though in the mean time they, poor souls, endured misery enough.' Such was the flight of Robinson and Brewster, and their followers, from the land of their fathers."

Mr. Robinson and his congregation, upon their arrival in Holland, first joined themselves to the church at Amsterdam; but owing to the dissensions that had broken out amongst its members, at the end of a year, they removed to Leyden. Amongst the companions of Mr. Robinson were several, who afterwards played distinguished parts in the settlement of New England. Brewster and Bradford, Carver and Winslow, are names which can never be obliterated from the page of our history, or forgotten by their grateful descendants. Some of them were men of fortune and family; yet so poor were they at this time, that Brewster became a printer, Bradford a silk-dyer, and many of the others learned mechanical trades. But the church rapidly increased by new immigrations from England, and it soon numbered three hundred communicants.

During the ten years that succeeded, Mr. Robinson published several controversial works, mostly in explanation, or defence, of his peculiar views. He also engaged in a public dispute with Episcopius, the champion of the Arminians, at the request of the Calvinistic professors in the University of Leyden. If we may rely upon Gov. Bradford, the Arminians had little reason to be proud of the result.

The principles of the church at Leyden are thus summed up in Belknap's *Life of Robinson*, so far as regards church government, and the sacraments. In their doctrinal creed they were strictly Calvinistic.

1. That no church ought to consist of more members than can conveniently meet together for worship and discipline.

2. That any church of Christ is to consist only of such as appear to believe in, and obey him.

3. That any competent number of such have a right, when conscience obliges them, to form themselves into a distinct church.

4. That this incorporation is by some contract or covenant, express or implied.

5. That, being thus incorporated, they have a right to choose their own officers.

6. That these officers are pastors or teaching elders, ruling elders, and deacons.

7. That elders being chosen, and ordained, have no power to rule the church, but by consent of the brethren.

8. That all elders, and all churches, are equal in respect of powers and privileges.

9. With respect to ordinances, they hold that baptism is to be administered to visible believers and their infant children; but they admitted only the children of communicants to baptism. That the

Lord's Supper is to be received sitting at the table. (Whilst they were in Holland they received it every Lord's day.) That ecclesiastical censures were wholly spiritual, and not to be accompanied with temporal penalties.

10. They admitted no holy days but the Christian sabbath, though they had occasionally days of fasting and thanksgiving; and finally, they renounced all right of human invention or imposition in religious matters.

Mr. Robinson's opinions respecting the Church of England seem about this time to have undergone some change. At the commencement of his ministry among the separatists, in common with Browne, he denounced that church as essentially antichristian, and would neither regard her members as brethren, nor hear her ministers preach. How far his opinions were modified is a matter of some doubt. Baylis says of him, "that he ruined the rigid separatists, allowing the lawfulness of communicating with the Church of England, in the word and prayers, though not in the sacraments and discipline; that he was the principal overthrower of the Brownists, and became the author of independency." Gov. Winslow says, "Mr. Robinson was always against a separation from any of the churches of Christ, holding communion with the reformed churches both in Scotland, France, and the Netherlands; that the church at Leyden made no schism or separation from the reformed churches but, as occasion afforded, held communion with them." Yet it does not appear that Mr. Robinson was ever willing to admit, that the Church of England, as a national establishment, was a Christian church, although he communed with its individual members.

In the year 1617, Mr. Robinson and his church began to think of a removal to America. The reasons, that mainly induced them to take this step, were the dissoluteness of manners that prevailed in Holland, and the consequent danger of contamination to which their children were exposed. They hoped that, on the wild shores of North America, they might be instrumental in the conversion of the natives, and at the same time build up a state, where they might worship God with none to molest or make them afraid. After some discussion as to the place where they should settle, Virginia was fixed upon. Two of their number were accordingly sent to treat with the Virginia company. But the company, though desirous that they should settle upon their territory, could not assure them of liberty of conscience. A connivance, if they carried themselves peaceably, was promised by the archbishop, but an open toleration was refused. After much negotiation, a patent was at last obtained in 1619; and by a contract

with some merchants in London, sufficient pecuniary resources were obtained to enable them to undertake the voyage.

The vessels not being sufficiently large to carry the whole congregation, Mr. Robinson remained with the majority at Leyden, and Elder Brewster accompanied the emigrants. At their departure Mr. Robinson preached a sermon, which showed a spirit of mildness and tolerance truly wonderful in that age, and which many, who claim to be the ministers of God, would do well to imitate in this. "Brethren, we are quickly to part from one another, and whether I may ever live to see your faces on earth any more, the God of heaven only knows; but whether the Lord hath appointed that or not, I charge you, before God and his blessed angels, that you follow me no further than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ. If God reveal any thing to you by any other instrument of his, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry; for I am fully persuaded, I am very confident, that the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy Word. For my part, I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the reformed churches, who are come to a period in religion, and will go at present no further than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw. Whatever part of his will our good God has revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it; and the Calvinists you see stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things.

"This is a misery much to be lamented, for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God; but were they now living would be as ready to embrace further light, as that which they first received. I beseech you to remember that it is an article of your church covenant, that you shall be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you, from the written word of God. Remember that, and every other article of your sacred covenant. But I must here withal exhort you to take heed what you receive as truth. Examine it, consider it, and compare it with other scriptures of truth, before you receive it, for it is not possible that the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-christian darkness, and that perfection of knowledge should break forth at once. I must advise you to abandon, avoid, and shake off the name of Brownists: it is a mere nickname, and a hand for the making religion, and the friends of religion, odious to the Christian world. Unto this end I shall be extremely glad if some godly minister would go with you, or come to you before you can have any company. For there will be no difference between the un-

conformable ministers and you, when you come to the practice of evangelical ordinances out of the kingdom; and I would wish you by all means to close with the godly people of England; study union with them in all things, wherever you can have it without sin, rather than in the least measure to effect a division or separation from them."

After leaving Holland, Elder Brewster, and that portion of the church which accompanied him, set sail for America; but because of the unseaworthiness of one of their vessels, were obliged to turn back to Plymouth. Again they set sail, and again returned. Leaving the discouraged and disaffected behind, the remainder, in all a hundred souls, in a single ship, for the last time, set forth to find a new home in the solitudes of the wilderness.

The church planted by these exiles at Plymouth, was the first church organized in New England. To repeat the story of their privations and sufferings would only be to repeat what every one is already familiar with. For ten years they struggled on with unabated hope, strong in their confidence of the protection of Heaven. In 1629 a new settlement was made at Salem. These emigrants were Puritans, but had never been ranked amongst the separatists. Their principles of church government were essentially the same with those of the church at Plymouth, and a harmonious intercourse soon commenced between the two settlements, which was never interrupted. Very soon after the arrival of the emigrants at Salem, a day was appointed for the organization of a church. The day was spent in fasting and prayer, and thirty persons gave their assent to a confession of faith and covenant. A day was also set apart for the trial and choice of a pastor and teacher. Says Bradford: "The forenoon they spent in prayer and teaching; the afternoon about the trial and election, choosing Mr. Skelton pastor, and Mr. Higginson teacher; and they accepting, Mr. Higginson, with three or four more of the gravest members of the church, lay their hands on Mr. Skelton, with solemn prayer. Then Mr. Skelton did the like upon Mr. Higginson; and another day is appointed for the choice of elders." By invitation, a delegation from Plymouth was present at the ceremony. It should perhaps be stated here, that both Mr. Skelton and Mr. Higginson had been previously ordained by bishops of the church of England.

The settlers at Salem expressly denied themselves to be separatists; but it seems to have been rather a denial of their name, than of their principles. "The New England Puritans," says Hutchinson, "when at full liberty went the full length, which the separatists did in England." So Bradford in his History of Massachusetts says, "That Mr.

Skelton, and Mr. Endicott, were entirely in sentiment with the Plymouth church, as to the errors and corruptions of the Church of England, and to the propriety of a separation from it. They were agreed as to the real independence of the churches, and the perfect equality of their ministers or pastors." Between the church of Plymouth, and the churches subsequently formed at Boston and Dorchester, there at all times existed a strong friendship; and the Rev. John Colton in 1633 addressed his friends at Boston, "to take council with their Christian brethren of Plymouth, and do nothing to injure or offend them."

But it should not be forgotten that to Mr. Robinson and his church, at Leyden in the old world, and at Plymouth in the new, we owe the first modern developments of the principles of the Congregational polity. To their example and success were, no doubt, owing all the subsequent religious settlements of New England. That all their distinctive opinions respecting church government should have been adopted by those who at first divided them, is an honourable testimony to the correctness of their logic; and a proper reward of that firmness of purpose, which led them, years before, to separate themselves from the rest of their Puritan brethren. All the early emigrants were Congregationalists in discipline. To them the Scriptures were a perfect pattern in government and worship, as well as in faith and doctrine, and to the New Testament they looked for the model after which every church was to be formed.

For several years after the landing of the Plymouth exiles, Elder Brewster performed all the duties of a pastor, except the administration of the sacraments, but steadily refused to be ordained. In 1625 Mr. Robinson died, and after his death, the church at Leyden was dissolved, a part going to Amsterdam, and a part afterwards joining their friends at Plymouth. At the end of ten years the colony contained only three hundred souls, and its growth was slow compared with the growth of its sister settlements.

In 1630 a church was organized in Charlestown. Hutchinson thus describes the proceedings: "At Charlestown the governor, deputy governor, and the minister, Mr. Wilson, on the 30th day of July, the fast day, entered into a church covenant; two days after, they allowed five more to join them; and so others, from time to time. At length they in form chose Mr. Wilson for their minister, and ordained him; but all joined in a protestation, that it was not a renouncing of the ministry he received in England, but that it was a confirmation in consequence of the election." Similar modes of organization seem to have followed in the other colonies, and distinct churches were

formed in each, one after another. It does not appear, however, that there was any uniform plan of church government, until Mr. Colton's arrival in 1633. To him was owing the introduction of some general plans embracing all the churches, "which from that time took the name of Congregational."

In 1632 a new church was formed at Duxbury, by colonization from the church at Plymouth; and others were soon afterwards formed at Marshfield, Eastham, and other places in the neighbourhood. In the same manner Connecticut was settled in 1635, by colonies from Massachusetts Bay.

To give in detail the ecclesiastical history of the separate plantations is impossible in the limits to which this outline is necessarily confined; and I shall therefore confine myself to those events in which colonies generally were interested.

For near a hundred years after the planting of the colonies, it is impossible to separate their ecclesiastical from their political history. A history of the churches is a history of the plantations. Without intending it, and indeed with principles in their full developement essentially hostile to any connexion between the state and the church, the Pilgrims so blended together religious and political institutions, that both religious and political liberty grew sickly and feeble from the unnatural union.

Impelled solely in their emigration by pious considerations, civil freedom had a subordinate place in their esteem. First of all, they wished liberty to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. The form of their government, and their rights under it, were but a secondary matter. But the forms of church government, which they considered scriptural, were democratic, and their political institutions naturally took the same form. There were few at first to be found who were not members of some church; and therefore the laws relating to ecclesiastical matters were, in effect, binding upon the whole community. To deprive all but church members of the privileges of freemen, would in our day be most arbitrary and oppressive; yet it can scarcely be deemed to have been so at that time, when ninety-nine out of one hundred were ranked in that class. From this preponderance of one class and one interest, is to be traced that intolerant spirit, which showed itself in the restrictions of suffrage, and the persecutions of the Anabaptists and Quakers. The errors of our pilgrim fathers consisted, not in the original character of the institutions they founded, but in their refusal so to modify them, so as to meet the changing circumstances of the times. Where all are of one mind, there can be no oppression. It is only where the partisans of

new opinions appear, that tolerance can be exercised. The Puritans of New England were intolerant, because they did not see, that the colonists of 1660 were not the emigrants of 1630; they united the state and the church, because they forgot that the church had ceased to be the state.

It is by keeping these facts in mind that we are able satisfactorily to explain those transactions which are seemingly inexplicable: their dislike to the interference of the General Court in religious matters, and their admission of the right of the civil magistrate to exercise coercive power when churches grew schismatical; their intrepid assertion of the principles of political liberty in their relations with Great Britain, and their arbitrary proceedings towards Roger Williams and his followers.

For many years the ministers depended upon the voluntary contributions of their hearers for their support. It was not until 1655 that any legislative proceedings were had in respect to their maintenance. It was at first ordered, that if any should refuse to pay, the magistrate should use such means as should put them upon their duty. But this failing of its intended effect, it was soon after ordered, that the ministers should be supported by a tax assessed upon the congregations.

Among the remarkable events of this early period were the trial and banishment of Roger Williams. There seems to have been in the mind of this extraordinary man a strange confusion of opinions, which manifested itself both in his language and his actions. Whilst to him is due the glory of having first promulgated the great principle, that there should be a general and unlimited toleration for all religions; and that to punish men for matters of conscience was persecution: yet at the same time he held, that it was not lawful for good men to join in family prayer with those they judged unregenerate, or at the communion table with those who did not perfectly agree with them in their religious sentiments. He was banished, much to the discontent of the people of Salem, with whom he was very popular, and where he had made many converts. He retired to Providence, which was without the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, and there laid the foundations of a state in which unlimited toleration prevailed.

A dispute that arose at this time in consequence of the teachings of Mr. Williams, strongly marks the spirit of the times. One of his followers, in the ardour of his zeal, cut from the king's colours the cross. For this he was reprimanded and turned out of his office; but the public mind being divided as to the propriety of his conduct, and several pamphlets having been written on the subject, the matter

was at last settled by a compromise: the cross being retained in the banners of castles and ships, but omitted in those of the trained bands, or militia.

In 1637 began the famous ecclesiastical controversy respecting Antinomianism. Mrs. Hutchinson, the promulgator and chief defender of Antinomian tenets, seems to have maintained, according to the summary of her opinions in Neal, "that believers in Christ are personally united with the spirit of God; that commands to work out salvation with fear and trembling belong to none but such as are under the covenant of works; that sanctification is not sufficient evidence of a good state; and that immediate revelations about future events are to be believed as equally infallible with the scriptures." These opinions soon became the absorbing topics of discussion, and divided the whole colony into two parties, such as were for a covenant of works, and such as were for a covenant of grace. As the quarrel continued to rage with constantly increasing violence, a synod was called, which met at Newtown. This was the first synod convened in New England. It was composed of the ministers and messengers or delegates of the several churches. There were also present certain magistrates "who were allowed not only to hear, but to speak if they had a mind." The synod unanimously condemned Mrs. Hutchinson's opinions. But she and her followers, not being satisfied with this decision, and continuing to promulgate, with new zeal, their sentiments, recourse was had to the civil power, and she was banished to Rhode Island. She subsequently retired to the territory of New Amsterdam, where she perished by the hands of the Indians. Mr. Wheelwright, a clergyman of Boston who had embraced her opinions, subsequently renounced them, and her party, at least in name, became extinct.

In 1638 was founded Harvard College. The origin of this institution was the need which our ancestors felt of a body of men educated in the country, who might fill the places of those who had been educated in England. Nothing marks more strongly the value which they had placed upon learning, and the esteem with which they regarded learned men, than their early efforts and sacrifices to sustain this college, and to establish common schools in all the plantations. Reference was no doubt at first had, mainly, to the education of clergymen, as was the case in the foundation of Yale College; and a large proportion of the early graduates of both these institutions, became pastors in the various colonies. As early as 1646, common schools were established by law, and provision was made for their

support in all the towns within the jurisdiction of Massachusetts. No provision was made in Plymouth till some years after, but the children were taught by teachers employed by the parents.

In 1642, in answer to an application made from Virginia, to the General Court, for ministers of the gospel, three ministers were sent; but the legislature of that colony immediately passing an act that no clergymen be permitted to officiate, under the penalty of banishment, but one ordained by some bishop in England, and who should subscribe to the constitutions of the established church, they were obliged to return. This law shows that the clergymen of Virginia were no more inclined to tolerate dissenters than the New England Puritans. Indeed the former seem to have been wiser in their intolerance, for they passed precautionary laws against the Puritans before there were any in their colony. But the congregation collected by these ministers continued to flourish for a number of years, although under circumstances of great discouragement. The pastor and teachers were banished, some of the members imprisoned, and many disarmed, which, says an old writer, "was very harsh in such a country, where the heathen lie around them."*

On the other hand, the Pilgrims were equally intolerant to the Episcopalians, who were not allowed publicly to observe their forms of worship. Probably, in both colonies, religious bigotry was made more cruel by their dislike of each other's political opinions: Virginia adhering to the king, and New England to the Parliament.

About this time Elder Brewster died, at Plymouth. No man in her early history deserves to hold a higher place in the grateful recollections of the people of New England. In early life he had been secretary to Davison, Queen Elizabeth's minister to Scotland and Holland, in which capacity he very much distinguished himself. He inherited considerable wealth, but spent it freely to supply the wants of his poor persecuted companions. In common with them, he suffered the severest privations, at Leyden and at Plymouth; yet, says Baylis, "He possessed that happy elasticity of mind, which could accommodate itself with cheerfulness to all circumstances. Destitute of meat, of fish, and of bread, over his simple meal of clams, would he return thanks to the Lord, that could suck up the abundance of the seas, and of the treasures hid in the sands."

The restrictions which were placed on the rights of suffrage caused much discontent in the colony of Massachusetts Bay. A petition was presented to the General Court, complaining that so many of the

* Hawk's Ecclesiastical History of Virginia.

citizens were debarred from having a vote in the elections, and from holding office; and also that so many "good people, members of the Church of England," are prohibited the Lord's supper, because they will not subscribe the church's covenant, and yet "are compelled on Lord's day to appear at the congregation." They prayed for liberty to the members of the Church of England, not scandalous in their lives and conversation, to be received into the churches; or else "that liberty be granted them to settle themselves in a church way, according to the Reformation in England and Scotland;" with a threat of an appeal to the Parliament if their petition should be refused. The General Court immediately ordered the petitioners to be fined and imprisoned; and the people sustained the court by electing their president, Mr. Winthrop, governor every year after as long as he lived. This severity, which no one can justify, seems to have been mainly owing to the threat of the petitioners, the Pilgrims being exceedingly jealous of any appeals to England, which might authorize the Parliament to interfere in the ecclesiastical matters of the colonies.

In 1648, the second synod was held, in pursuance of the recommendation of the General Court. This assumption of a right on the part of the Court to call these assemblies, was much complained of by the deputies of the congregations, who were apprehensive lest the magistrates should regard this as a precedent for the exercise of their power in more important matters. But when it was represented that it was a request and not a command of the General Court, and that the decisions of the synod were not judicial, but merely advisory, the deputies consented to meet.

At this synod an unanimous vote was passed in these words: "This synod having perused and considered the Confession of Faith published by the late reverend assembly in England, do judge it to be very holy, orthodox, and judicious in all matters of faith, and do, therefore, fully and freely consent thereto, for the substance thereof; only in those things which have respect unto church government and discipline, we refer ourselves to the platform of church discipline agreed upon by this present assembly." The platform here referred to is the one generally known as the Cambridge Platform. This instrument, to which I shall more particularly refer hereafter, was in some sort regarded as the federal constitution of the Congregational Church. It never was established at Plymouth, by act of government, but was generally conformed to in practice. Previous to this synod the churches of New England had never agreed upon any uniform scheme of discipline.

Soon after the dissolution of this synod the Anabaptists appeared in Massachusetts, who were followed, after a brief interval, by the Quakers. The former were banished from Massachusetts, and a law was passed by the General Court, forbidding any one to advocate their principles under the penalty of banishment. Mr. Dunstar, who had embraced these opinions, resigned his office as President of Harvard College. It seems a little singular that Mr. Chauncey should have been chosen to succeed him, entertaining, as he did, the same opinions in substance as Mr. Dunstar. The Baptists were more favourably received in the colony of Plymouth, where they settled the town of Swanzey.

The Quakers first appeared in 1656; two women from Barbadoes, who on their arrival, says Neal, "were put in prison, and examined by proper persons for tokens of witchcraft." They were sent back to Barbadoes, but others soon arrived. On being ordered to quit the jurisdiction, they refused, and the irritated magistrate proceeded to great severities. Some were whipped, some fined and imprisoned, and others banished. Nothing daunted by their sufferings, those who had been banished returned. A law was at last passed, punishing all who should thus return, with death. This law was carried by one vote in the Court of Deputies, but it never received the approbation of the people. Under its provisions three Quakers were executed.

For these barbarous proceedings no valid apology ever has been, or ever can be, offered. The most that can be said is, that they erred with others. King Charles, in a letter to Massachusetts, says: "We cannot be understood hereby to direct, or wish, that any indulgence should be shown to those persons commonly called Quakers." Nor were the principles of religious toleration better appreciated, or practised, in other countries. But to this remark Rhode Island forms a most honourable exception. In Connecticut, and New Haven, also, the Quakers suffered but little. By degrees these sanguinary laws of Massachusetts fell into disuse.

In 1661, arose the debates concerning the right of the grandchildren of church members to the ordinance of baptism. The dispute began in Connecticut, several years before, in one of the churches at Hartford. It originated in the same cause, that has been already spoken of, the exclusion of all but church members from the privileges of freemen. This exclusion, little complained of at first, when few were to be found out of the pale of the churches, became regarded as a heavy grievance, when the number of those, thus excluded, was greatly increased by the arrival of new emigrants no longer actuated by religious considerations. It was therefore de-

manded, that all, who were not openly unworthy, should be admitted to the church without being required to profess a change of heart; and also all baptized persons, and all who had been members of churches elsewhere. As a step to the accomplishment of these ends, it was claimed, that all the children of those who had been baptized, upon owning the covenant, should themselves be baptized. It was apparent, that to yield to these demands, would be destructive to vital piety in the churches, and they were therefore strenuously opposed.

The colonies of Massachusetts and Connecticut, contrary to the advice of the colony of New Haven, called a council, which met in 1657. In reply to a question respecting the subjects of baptism, it was decided by the council, that those who, being grown up to years of discretion, of blameless life, and understanding the grounds of religion, should own the covenant made with their parents, by entering thereinto in their own proper persons, should have the ordinance of baptism administered to their children.

This decision not being regarded as satisfactory, and the disputes raging more fiercely than ever: a synod was called at Boston, to which the same questions were propounded that had been previously discussed in the council. The answer respecting the proper subjects of baptism, was in substance the same; and it was held, that all baptized persons were to be considered members of the church, and if not openly dissolute, admitted to all its privileges, except partaking of the Lord's Supper. This decision of the synod was strenuously opposed by Mr. Chauncey, President of Harvard College, Increase Mather, and others of the most distinguished ministers in the colonies. It was justly judged by them, that to admit unregenerate persons into the pale of the church, would be most pernicious to the interests of true religion.

The result seemed to justify their fears. In Hartford, in one month, 192 persons took the covenant, comprising almost all the young people in the congregation. The number of those in full communion was small.* "Correct moral deportment, with a profession of correct doctrinal opinions, and a desire for regeneration, came to be regarded as the only qualifications for admission to the communion. This innovation, though not as yet publicly advocated by any, there is conclusive proof, had become quite extensive in practice, previously to 1679. The churches soon came to consist, in many places, very considerably of unregenerate persons; of those who regarded them-

* Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, article Congregationalists.

selves, and were regarded by others, as unregenerate. Of all these things the consequence was, that within thirty years after the commencement of the eighteenth century, a large proportion of the clergy throughout the country were either only speculatively correct, or to some extent actually erroneous in their religious opinions—maintaining regularly the forms of religion, but in some instances having well-nigh lost, and in others, it is to be feared, having never felt, its power.”

One of the warmest defenders of the Half-way Covenant, as it was called, was Mr. Stoddard, minister at Northampton, who carried on a public controversy respecting it, with Increase Mather, of Boston. He maintained, that it was the duty of unconverted persons to come to the Lord’s Supper, “though they knew that they had no true goodness, or gospel holiness.” His grandson, President Edwards, at first adopted his opinions, but subsequently renounced them; and wrote with great ability to disprove them. The Half-way Covenant continued to be used for many years; but after a bitter experience of the pernicious consequences attending it, it was laid aside in all the orthodox Congregational churches.

After the restoration of Charles II. many of the ejected ministers sought a refuge in New England. For the twenty years previous, there had been but little emigration to the colonies, the Parliament tolerating at home all sects but the Episcopalians.

The persecutions against the Quakers still continuing, though with much less severity than at first, a letter was written in 1669, by Dr. Goodwin, and Dr. Owen, and others of the leading Independents in England, to Massachusetts, recommending them “to put an end to the sufferings and confinement of the persons censured, and to restore them to their former liberty; and to allow them to practise the principles of their dissent, if unaccompanied with a disturbance of the public peace.” The tolerant counsels of this letter were not immediately complied with, but the severity of the laws was gradually mitigated.

In 1658 a Confession of Faith was adopted by the English Congregational churches, at a convention held in the Savoy which, with a few variations, was the same as that agreed to by the Westminster Assembly. This confession was approved of by a synod convened at Boston, in 1680, and is to this day considered as a correct exposition of the opinions of the Congregationalists.

New articles of discipline were adopted by the churches of Connecticut, at an assembly of ministers and delegates held at Saybrook, in 1708. The Saybrook Platform differs from the Cambridge Plat-

form chiefly in the provision that it makes respecting councils and associations. This synod was held in pursuance of an Act of the Legislature, ordering it to draw up a form of ecclesiastical discipline. The expenses of the ministers and delegates were to be paid from the public treasury.

The system agreed upon by the synod was presented to the Legislature, at their next session, by whom it was approved in the following terms: "This Assembly do declare their great approbation of such an happy agreement; and do ordain, that all the churches within this government that are, or shall be, thus united in doctrine, worship, and discipline, be, and for the future shall be, owned, and acknowledged, and established by law; provided always, that nothing herein shall be intended or construed to hinder or prevent any society or church that is, or shall be, allowed by the laws of this government, who soberly differ or dissent from the United Churches, hereby established, from exercising worship and discipline in their own way, according to their consciences." The synod also gave their assent to the Confession of Faith adopted by the synod at Boston, 1680.

About the year 1740, New England was blessed with a powerful revival, which embraced all the colonies. Some extravagances, which attended it in Connecticut, gave rise to an Act of the Legislature, by which ministers were forbidden to preach out of their own parishes, unless expressly invited by a clergyman and the major part of his church; and if any evangelist preached, without being requested to do so by the inhabitants, he was to be sent as a vagrant out of the limits of the colony. Two parties arose among the people and in the Legislature, frequently called the old and the new lights, who bestowed on each other the epithets of cold, dead preachers, formalists, and Arminians, on the one hand, and of enthusiasts and fanatics, on the other. Much opposition was manifested to the interference of the Legislature, as being contrary to the liberty of conscience.

As early as 1750 the principles of the Unitarians had been extensively adopted by members of the Congregational churches. There was not, however, between such, and those who held fast to the faith of their fathers, an open separation, until some years later. In 1785 several churches in Boston ceased from their confessions of faith, and many others followed in their footsteps. Harvard College fell into the hands of the Unitarians, and is now under their control. But the Congregational form of church government is still retained by the Unitarian churches.

During the French, and still more during the revolutionary war, religion suffered much, great laxity of morals prevailed, and very many were avowed infidels. But the disastrous result of the French revolution opened the eyes of many to the insufficiency of human reason, as a guide in religion, and to the importance of Christianity, as the safeguard and preservative of all governments, especially of republics.

Great efforts were also made by the clergy to prevent the further progress of infidel principles; and a revival of religion which commenced in Connecticut, and spread throughout New England, was followed by the happiest consequences. At the present day, probably in no portion of the world, will fewer infidels, or openly immoral men be found, than in the New England states.

The connexion that existed between the Congregational system of church polity, and the civil power, was severed in most of the colonies by the revolution. In none of the new constitutions was there any provision made for the support of any particular form of worship by law. It will be useful to glance at some of the early laws of New England, both because they have been much misrepresented and misunderstood, and because they may serve us as landmarks, by which we may judge of our progress in religious freedom.

Most of the religious, and many of the political disputes, which arose in the early history of New England, are to be traced to the unfortunate connexion that existed between the churches and the civil authorities. The manner in which the connexion grew up, has been already alluded to. Both in Massachusetts and Connecticut all the citizens were obliged by law to support public worship and church rates were collected in the same way as town rates. But to this there was one exception: the salaries of the Boston ministers, down to 1700, were paid by voluntary contributions, collected after divine service, and given to them by the deacons every Monday morning. Every church first chose its own pastor, and, if the majority of the inhabitants of the town concurred, he was supported by an assessment upon the inhabitants. If the town did not concur, a council was held of the elders, or messengers of the three, or five neighbouring churches, and if they approved of him, whom the churches had chosen, he was appointed their minister. Before a church could be gathered, it was necessary that the consent of the magistrates should be obtained, and if a minister preached to such a church, he was liable to a penalty. If the councils called to settle disputes did not agree, or if the contending parties were contumacious, "it was a common thing for the civil magistrate to interfere, and put an end to the dispute." In Con-

neglect the interference of the Assembly in religious matters was frequent.

All persons were obliged, under a penalty of five shillings for every neglect, to attend public worship on Sunday and other days set apart to devotional exercises. It was not, however, obligatory on any one to attend the Congregational churches. Every one was allowed to worship peacefully in his own way, by applying to the General Court, and declaring his wishes. Church censures were declared invalid to depose, or degrade any man from any civil office, authority, or dignity, which he should sustain in the colony.

In a declaration of the General Court, it is said: "That the civil magistrate had power and liberty to see the peace ordinances and rules of Christ observed in every church according to his word, and also to deal with every church member in a way of civil justice." So in Halbard's Survey of the Cambridge Platform: "Church government and civil government may very well stand together, it being the duty of the magistrate to take care of matters of religion."

The Congregational form of church government, although not in name, yet in effect, was the established ecclesiastical system of Massachusetts, and of New England generally. In the former colony, no other form was tolerated for the first fifty years, and towns were required to settle ministers of that denomination. The law afterwards became more favourable to the Quakers, Anabaptists, and Episcopalians. But at first, polls were alone exempted, while the estate was taxed for the support of the Congregational clergy.

It is evident to every thinking man, that any connexion between the state and the church, is utterly hostile to the genius of Congregationalism. Indeed, the term church, in the sense in which it is used, when we speak of the Church of England, or the Presbyterian Church, is wholly inapplicable here. Any body of men, uniting together for religious purposes, constitutes a church, perfect and complete in all its parts. It is therefore that we speak of the Congregational churches, as we speak of the United States; each having an independent existence, and still sovereign, except so far as it has given up its rights by the act of union. That there may be a union between the state and church, the latter like the former must be an organized body, harmonious in its parts, and pervaded by a principle which is the law of its being, imperative, permanent, and universal. Such can never be the case with the Congregational churches; for there is no common law, other than the scriptures, to which they are obedient. Between the states and such a multitude of isolated independent communities there can be no union; and that any connexion ever existed between

them was owing to that peculiar combination of circumstances, which for many years made them one ; a unity, rather than a union of distinct bodies.

- In 1801 a plan of union was adopted between the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church and the General Association of Connecticut, with a view "to promote union and harmony in those new settlements which are composed of inhabitants from those bodies." By this plan, a Congregational church, if they settled a Presbyterian minister, might still conduct their discipline according to Congregational principles ; and on the other hand, a Presbyterian church with a Congregational minister retained its peculiar discipline. Under these regulations many new churches were formed, which after a time came under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly.

In 1837 this plan of union was abrogated by that body, as unconstitutional ; and several synods, which had been attached to it in consequence of the plan, were declared to be out of the ecclesiastical connexion.

The principles of the modern Congregationalists, as has been already said, differ but little from those held by John Robinson and the church at Leyden. The foundation and fundamental principles of their church polity is this : that a church is a company of pious persons, who voluntarily unite together for the worship of God. From this definition, as a starting-point, their whole system may logically be deduced. It is a voluntary union in this,—that every individual exercises his own judgment respecting the church with which he shall connect himself, acting in obedience to that law of God which commands all his children to become members of some visible church. Being, then, in a sense, self-created, each church is entirely independent of every other, except so far as it is bound by those laws of Christian intercourse which govern societies equally with individuals. It has the power to elect its own officers, to admit and to exclude members ; in short, to do all those acts which are recognised in the scriptures as coming within the province of a Christian church.

To the scriptures the Congregationalists appeal, as their only guide in all matters both of faith and polity. They believe that this system of church government is taught in the sacred writings, and sanctioned by the usage of the apostles and the early Christians. Creeds and confessions of faith, though used as formularies, are never to be regarded as tests of orthodoxy. They are merely compendiums of all the essential doctrines to which every one is expected

to subscribe: convenient guides in the examination of candidates, but not standards of religious truth. In this light are the various confessions of faith, which at different times have been adopted by synods, to be regarded. No one of them has any further authority than as being the expression of the opinions of good and wise men. They have no claim to infallibility. By the Bible they are to be measured, and no doctrine which cannot be found in it is to be received, however endeared to us by its associations, or venerable by its antiquity. This strict adherence to the scriptures, as the only rule of faith and practice, must necessarily prevent many of those erroneous opinions, and that credulous reliance upon tradition, which are too apt to characterize those who follow the Bible only at second hand.

Probably no part of the Congregational polity has been so much misunderstood, as the union which exists between the individual churches. The idea of a central legislative and judicial power, which marks all other ecclesiastical systems, is here unknown. Councils and synods are merely advisory bodies, composed of delegates from the various churches, within certain local limits. They are, so to speak, a kind of congress, where the representatives of independent churches meet, to consult with each other respecting matters of general interest. But they become parties to no articles of union, which make the decisions of their representatives, thus convened, of binding authority. Each church is at liberty to accept or reject their decisions. As the judgments of impartial, wise, and good men, they will deservedly have great influence with all who are unprejudiced; but they are mere recommendations, not laws.

These councils are sometimes mutual, sometimes *ex parte*, and sometimes standing, or permanent. A mutual council, as the term denotes, is one called by the consent of both parties; an *ex parte* council, one which either party in the dispute may call, without the concurrence of the other. These councils are usually composed of the pastor and a lay delegate from each of the neighbouring churches; the disputing parties, by letters missive, designating the churches whose counsel they desire, and each of the churches thus addressed electing its own delegate.

Standing, or permanent councils are almost entirely confined to Connecticut. By the articles of discipline adopted at Saybrook, all the churches are consociated for mutual assistance in their ecclesiastical concerns. The pastors and churches of a county usually form one or more consociations; and all cases, which cannot be determined without the aid of a council, are brought before this body. Mutual and

ex parte councils have therefore, in great measure, gone into disuse in that state.

It has been a question somewhat controverted, whether the decisions of the consociations are final. In practice, however, they have generally been so regarded. Some advantages are doubtless possessed by this system over the others, especially as offering a speedy termination to disputes; but it must be admitted that consistency demands that every church should be its own judge in the last resort.

If a church should refuse to follow the advice of a council, and the case should be such as to warrant it, the other churches would withdraw their fellowship from it. Such a step would only be justifiable when its offences are such as no longer to permit the other churches to recognise it as a Christian church.

Difficult as it may seem in theory, for so many independent sovereignties to preserve uniformity in doctrine and harmony in action: yet it is believed that no religious denomination, for the last two hundred years, has swerved less from the principles of its early defenders, or maintained more perfect harmony amongst its members. This, no doubt, in a great measure, is to be ascribed to the constant appeal to the Bible as the guide in all matters of controversy.

The only church officers now recognised by the Congregationalists are pastors and deacons. In this respect they differ from the early churches, who admitted five orders, pastors, teachers, ruling elders, deacons, and deaconesses. The office of deaconess was soon dropped. Those of teacher, and ruling elder, were longer retained. According to Cotton Mather, the churches were nearly "destitute of such helps in government" about the year 1700. The office of elder went into disuse in the church at Plymouth in 1745.

In general, the ordination of a pastor was by the imposition of the hands of his brethren in the ministry; but, in a few instances, by the imposition of the hands of some of the lay brethren. One instance is mentioned, as having taken place at Taunton in 1640, where the ordination was performed by a schoolmaster and a husbandman, although two clergymen were present. "This," says Hutchinson, "at this day would be generally disapproved of and discountenanced, although it might not be considered as invalid." Other instances are mentioned by the early historians of New England. The Cambridge Platform holds the following language: "This ordination we account nothing else but the solemn putting a man into his place and office, whereto he had a right before by election, being like the installation of a magistrate in the commonwealth ordination; therefore it is not to go be-

fore, but to follow, election. The essence and substance of the outward calling of an ordinary officer in the church does not consist in his ordination, but in his voluntary and free election by the church, and his accepting of that election. Ordination does not constitute an officer, nor give him the essentials of his office. In such churches, where there are elders, imposition of hands in ordination is to be performed by the elders. In such churches, where there are no elders, imposition of hands may be performed by some of the brethren, orderly chosen by the church thereto."

At the present day lay ordination, under ordinary circumstances, would be regarded, by the great majority of Congregationalists, as highly improper, and probably, by some, as invalid.

Deacons are chosen by votes of the church. The practice in their ordination has not been entirely uniform.* One instance is mentioned where they were ordained without the imposition of hands. But, in general, the practice seems to have been that the pastor and elder both laid on hands; the pastor then prayed, and gave the charge, and the elder prayed. At present, ordination by imposition of hands is the custom in the majority of churches. The ministers of the neighbouring congregations are not invited to assist in the ceremony, as the office of deacon is purely local, and does not extend beyond the particular church for which he is chosen.

The common practice in the dismissal of a pastor is to call a mutual council. Should either the pastor or the congregation refuse to join in a mutual council the other party might then call a council *ex parte*.

In all the states, where Congregationalists are found, there exists some union or association of ministers, embracing all within certain local limits. These meetings are usually held at intervals of several weeks. The object of these meetings is personal improvement, and assistance by mutual counsel and advice.

The power of licensing ministers, is now generally entrusted to the associations of pastors. For many years after the settlement of the country, there was no regular way of introducing candidates into the ministry. "When they had finished their collegiate studies," says Trumbull, "if they imagined themselves qualified, and could find some friendly gentleman in the ministry to introduce them, they began to preach without an examination, or recommendation from any body of ministers or churches. If they studied a time with any particular mi-

* Thatcher's History of Plymouth.

nister or ministers, after they had received the honours of college, that minister, or those ministers, introduced them into the pulpit at pleasure, without the general consent and approbation of their brethren." To remedy the evils necessarily resulting from such laxity, the present system was adopted, and no one is now regarded as duly authorized to preach until he has undergone an examination by some association, and is recommended by it to the churches as properly qualified.

The organization of the churches as it exists in Connecticut, under the Saybrook Platform, has been already spoken of. A similar system, in most respects, has been adopted by the Congregationalists in other states.

In Massachusetts, a general association was formed in 1803, which now includes twenty-two distinct associations, and nearly all the Trinitarian clergy of the denomination in the state.

In Vermont, a general convention of the Congregational ministers, and churches, is held yearly, to which every association, presbytery, county conference, or consociation, sends two delegates. This body held its first session in 1796.

In New Hampshire, a pastoral convention was formed in 1747, including "those Congregational and Presbyterian ministers of that state, who own or acknowledge the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism as containing essentially their views of Christian doctrine." This organization continued until 1809, when a general association was formed, which held its first meeting the same year.

The ecclesiastical system of Maine is different from that of the other New England states in this, that it has no general association, or convention, of ministers. Each county, or other convenient district, has its own conference, which is expressly forbid the exercise of any authority or control over the churches. In 1823, a general conference was formed, to which delegates are sent from each county conference; but "no ecclesiastical power or authority shall ever be assumed by it, or by the delegates to it."

In Rhode Island, an evangelical association of ministers was formed in 1808. The next year the name was changed to that of the "Evangelical Consociation," by which it is now known. It has merely an advisory jurisdiction over the churches.

In Michigan, a general association was formed in 1842. By its articles of union, no judicial authority can be exercised over the ministers, or churches, belonging to it. Its prospects are thought to be highly encouraging.

In New York, many churches, originally founded by Congregationalists, and after the Congregational model, have, from a desire of harmony, and a more perfect union with their brother Christians, of the same doctrinal faith, adopted wholly or in part the Presbyterian discipline. In 1834, those churches who had retained the Congregational discipline formed a general association, in which both churches and ministers are represented: lay delegates representing the former. The number of churches and ministers connected with this body, is annually increasing.

The number of Congregationalists in each state of the Union, the writer has not been able to ascertain.

In 1841, the number of churches reported to the general association of Connecticut, was 246, and the number of pastors 211. In Vermont, there are about 200 ministers; in New Hampshire, about 150; in Rhode Island, 16; in New York, 150.

By the census of 1840, the number of Congregational ministers is rated at 1150; of congregations, 1300, and of members, 160,000. There have been founded in New England eight colleges, and four theological seminaries. All these institutions are in a flourishing condition.

So far as the political and social blessings of a people flow from their religious institutions, no greater praise can be demanded for the religious principles and polity of the Pilgrims, than that they be judged of by their fruits. The harmony between their ecclesiastical and political forms of government is apparent; nor is it too much to say, that the republicanism of the church was the father of the republicanism of the state. The English prelates were not far wrong, when they censured the Puritans as cherishing principles which, in their developement, would overthrow both hierarchal, and regal despotism. "In New England the war of the Revolution commenced."* In New England was devised, and carried into effect, that system of school education, which has made her people more generally intelligent than the people of any other portion of our continent. In New England, at the present day, is to be found less immorality, vice, and unbelief, than exists in any other country of equal extent upon the globe. When we recollect, that for near two hundred years after its settlement, there was scarcely a single church of any other denomination within its limits, "to Congregationalists and to Congregational principles it must chiefly be ascribed, that New England is what it is."

Those who desire more particular information of the principles of the Congregationalists, are referred to "Punchard on Congregationalism," the second edition of which has just been published. It is a full, impartial, and able work. A history of Congregationalism by the same author will, when completed, be a very valuable addition to our stock of historical knowledge. Much information will also be found in Dr. Bacon's "Church Manual," Mr. Mitchell's "Guide," Dr. Hawes' "Tribute to the Pilgrims," and Prof. Upham's "Ratio Disciplinæ."

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIANS.

BY RICHARD BEARD, D. D.

PRESIDENT OF CUMBERLAND COLLEGE, AT PRINCETON, KENTUCKY.

NEAR the close of the last century a great revival of religion occurred in the western country. The first indications of it appeared in May, A. D. 1797, in Kentucky, in Gaspar River Congregation, under the ministry of the Rev. James McGready. Mr. McGready was a pupil of the Rev. Dr. McMillan, the founder of Jefferson College. After having completed his course of studies, preparatory to the ministry, he spent some time in North Carolina, where he preached the gospel with great power and success. In 1796 he removed from North Carolina and settled in Kentucky, in charge of the congregations of Gaspar river, Red river, and Muddy river. Soon after his settlement in these congregations, in consequence of what he considered the deplorable state of religious feeling and practice among the people of his charge, he proposed to them the following preamble and covenant:

“When we consider the reward and promises of a compassionate God to the poor lost family of Adam, we find the strongest encouragement for Christians to pray in faith, to ask in the name of Jesus for the conversion of their fellow-men. None ever went to Christ when on earth, with the case of their friends, that were denied; and although the days of his humiliation are ended, yet, for the encouragement of his people, he has left it on record, that where two or three agree on earth to ask in prayer *believing*, it shall be done. Again, ‘Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.’ With these promises before us, we feel encouraged to unite our supplications to a prayer,—hearing God for the outpouring of his Spirit, that his people may be quickened and comforted, and that our children and sinners, generally, may be converted. Therefore we bind ourselves to observe the third Saturday of each month, for one year, as a day of fasting and prayer

for the conversion of sinners in Logan county, and throughout the world. We also engage to spend half an hour every Saturday evening, beginning at the setting of the sun, and half an hour every Sabbath morning at the rising of the sun, in pleading with God to revive his work.”*

To this preamble and covenant the pastor and the principal members of his congregations affixed their names. Having thus solemnly pledged themselves to God and to each other, they betook themselves to fervent and persevering prayer. In May following, A. D. 1797, appeared the beginnings of the great and gracious revival. The first cases of seriousness and conversion occurred in the Gaspar river congregation. In September 1798, the congregations of Red river and Muddy river participated to some extent in the work. In the following year the work developed itself in increasing interest and power, but was still confined to Mr. McGready's three congregations. In 1800 it extended itself into what was then called the Cumberland country, and manifested itself in great power in Shiloh congregation, which was under the pastoral care of the Rev. Wm. Hodge. Large meetings began to be held in different parts of Kentucky and the Cumberland country, mainly superintended by the Rev. Messrs. James McGready, Wm. Hodge, and Wm. McGee. On these occasions it was customary for families to attend from a distance of many miles, sometimes twenty, fifty, and even a hundred. As a matter of convenience many went in their wagons, carried their provisions, and lodged upon the ground, either in their wagons, or in temporary cloth tents. This was the origin of camp meetings.

The original and most efficient promoters of the revival were Presbyterian ministers, and a large proportion of the population of Kentucky and Tennessee, were emigrants from Virginia and the Carolinas, and were under the influence of Presbyterian partialities. As a matter of course, the revival created a demand for an increase of Presbyterian ministers. The calls for ministerial labour were constant and multiplying. In this state of things a suggestion was made to the revival ministers by the Rev. David Rice, (then the most aged Presbyterian minister in Kentucky, and considered the father of the church in the West,) that they should select from the churches men of piety and promise, and encourage them to prepare for the work of the ministry, although they might not have, and might not be able to obtain, that amount of education required by the book of discipline. It was thought that the wants of the congregations required a resort

* History of the Christian Church, by the Rev. James Smith, pp. 565, 566.

to the use of extraordinary means. Accordingly, three men, Alexander Anderson, Finis Ewing, and Samuel King, were encouraged to prepare written discourses, and present themselves before the Transylvania presbytery, at its sessions in the fall of 1801. They were men of undaunted piety, and of very respectable intelligence, and had already been useful in promoting the revival. When their case was brought before the presbytery, the measure met with strong opposition. They were permitted, however, to read their discourses privately to Mr. Rice, who reported favourably; and they were then encouraged to catechize and exhort in the vacant congregations, and prepare discourses to be read at the next sessions of the presbytery. At the subsequent meeting of the presbytery, Mr. Anderson was received as a candidate for the ministry; the others were rejected, but continued as catechists and exhorters. In the fall, however, of 1802, they were all licensed as probationers for the holy ministry, having adopted the confession of faith of the Presbyterian Church, with the exception of the idea of fatality, which seemed to them to be taught in that book under the mysterious doctrines of election and reprobation.

At the first sessions of the Kentucky synod, held in October 1802, the Transylvania presbytery was divided, and the Cumberland presbytery was formed, including the Green river and Cumberland countries. This presbytery met on the 5th day of April, 1803, and was composed of the following ministers: Thomas B. Craighead, T. Templin, John Bowman, Samuel Donnel, James Balch, James McGready, Wm. Hodge, Wm. McGee, John Rankin, and Samuel McAdam. The first five were considered opposers, the others were promoters of the revival. In the course of the year, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Ewing were ordained, several young men were licensed as probationers for the ministry, and some were received as candidates. At the spring meeting of the presbytery in 1804, the members opposed to the revival objected to Mr. Ewing's being invited to a seat, on the ground of illegality; but the objection was overruled by a large majority. In June of this year, Mr. King was ordained, and in the course of the year a few licensings occurred.

At the sessions of the Kentucky synod in October, 1804, a letter of remonstrance against the proceedings of the Cumberland presbytery was presented, signed by Thomas B. Craighead, Samuel Donnel, and James Bowman. After some discussion, an order was passed, "That the parties, both complained of and complaining, be cited to appear at the next stated session of the synod, with all the

light and testimony on the subject that can be afforded.”* In June following, Messrs. Samuel Hodge, Thomas Nelson, and William Dickey were ordained.

At the session of the Kentucky synod in October, 1805, none of the members of the Cumberland presbytery were present, except Rev. Messrs. Samuel Donnel and William Dickey. Their book of records, however, was presented by Mr. Donnel, and a committee appointed to examine it. From the report of the committee, a commission was appointed by the synod, and vested with full synodical powers, to confer with the presbytery, and adjudicate upon their proceedings. The commission was composed of the following members: Rev. Messrs. John Lyle, John P. Campbell, Archibald Cameron, Joseph P. Howe, Samuel Rennels, Robert Stuart, Joshua L. Wilson, Thomas Cleland, and Isaac Tull, and Messrs. William McDowell, Robert Brank, James Allin, James Henderson, Richard Gaines, and Andrew Wallace, elders. The commission met, according to appointment, on the third day of December, 1805, at Gaspar river meeting-house. All the implicated members of the Cumberland presbytery were present: Rev. Messrs. James McGready, William Hodge, William McGee, John Rankin, and Samuel McAdam; also, Rev. Messrs. Finis Ewing, Samuel King, Thomas Nelson, and Samuel Hodge, who had been ordained by the presbytery, and Hugh Kirkpatrick, James B. Porter, Robert Bell, David Foster, and Thomas Caehoon, who had been licensed as probationers, and Robert Guthrie, Samuel K. Blythe, and Samuel Donnel, who had been received as candidates. On the third day of their sessions the commission passed the following resolution:

“On motion, resolved, that the commission of synod do proceed to examine those persons irregularly licensed, and those irregularly ordained by the Cumberland presbytery, and judge of their qualifications for the gospel ministry.”

To this requisition the members of the presbytery refused to submit, alleging that “they had the exclusive right to examine and license their own candidates, and that the synod had no right to take them out of their hands.”

On the fourth day of their sessions, the commission passed an additional resolution, “adjuring them to submit to the authority which God had established in his church, and with which the commission was clothed.” After consultation, and prayer for divine direction, the members of the presbytery still refused. The commission then called on the

* History of the Christian Church, by the Rev. James Smith, p. 569.

young men, respecting whose advancement to the ministry the difficulty had originated, to submit to a re-examination. It was requested that they might be permitted to retire and ask counsel of the Most High. To this request objections were made, but it was at length granted. After retirement and prayer they still refused to submit to a re-examination, assigning as their reasons, "That they considered the Cumberland presbytery a regular church judicatory, and competent to judge of the faith and ability of its candidates; that they themselves had not been charged with heresy or immorality, and if they had, the presbytery would have been the proper judicature to call them to an account." Whereupon the commission passed a resolution, prohibiting all those who had been licensed and ordained, in what they considered an irregular manner, from exhorting, preaching the gospel, or administering the ordinances of the church, in consequence of any authority which they had derived from the Cumberland presbytery, until they submitted to the jurisdiction of the commission of synod, and underwent the requisite examination. This resolution was considered unconstitutional, and of course null and void.

As soon as the commission dissolved, the members of the Cumberland presbytery, who had been friendly to the revival, formed themselves into a council, for the purpose of trying to keep themselves and their congregations together until their difficulties could be settled by the proper judicatures of the church. They still preached, administered the ordinances, and held occasional meetings for conference; but transacted no presbyterial business. In the meantime, their labours were abundantly blessed in promoting the kingdom of Christ, and turning the western wilderness into a fruitful field.

In the spring of 1807, the council drew up an able and very respectful letter of remonstrance to the General Assembly. To this letter the assembly replied, "That as the council had not come regularly before that body by appeal, they did not consider themselves called on judicially to decide on their case."

In the spring of 1808, the council sent a petition to the General Assembly praying for the interference of that body in their behalf. The assembly replied to the petition, "That, as the matter had not been brought up to them by appeal from the Synod of Kentucky, they could give no relief; but must refer the petitioners to the synod itself, as the only constitutional body competent to reverse what they had done wrong."* They were encouraged, however, by private

* Smith's History of the Christian Church, p. 628.

intimations from the General Assembly, that in process of time they would obtain a redress of their grievances. Owing to the embarrassed condition of the council in the spring of 1809, it was impossible for them to prosecute an appeal to the assembly. But that body was addressed by the Synod of Kentucky, by letter, respecting the difficulties, the result of which was a resolution equivalent to a confirmation of all the proceedings of the synod in relation to the business. The members of the council received intelligence of this decision with astonishment and sorrow, and at their next meeting, August, 1809, a large majority was in favour of an immediate constitution as an independent presbytery. But some hesitated, and wished to make a last effort with the synod for a reconciliation. It was unanimously agreed, therefore, to appoint two commissioners to propose terms to the synod, or to the Transylvania Presbytery, to which they had previously been attached by a dissolution of the Cumberland Presbytery. This commission failed to effect a compromise, and the result was, that three members of the council, Rev. Messrs. Finis Ewing, Samuel King, and Samuel McAdam, in February, 1810, constituted the Cumberland Presbytery, from which has grown the present Cumberland Presbyterian Church. The following is the record of their constitution :

“In Dickson County, State of Tennessee, at the Rev. Samuel McAdam’s, this 4th day of February, 1810 :

“We, Samuel McAdam, Finis Ewing, and Samuel King, regularly ordained ministers of the Presbyterian Church, against whom no charge either of immorality or heresy has ever been exhibited before any judicature of the church, having waited in vain more than four years, in the meantime petitioning the General Assembly, for a redress of grievances, and a restoration of our violated rights, have and do hereby agree and determine, to constitute ourselves into a presbytery, known by the name of the Cumberland Presbytery, on the following conditions :

“All candidates for the ministry, who may hereafter be licensed by this presbytery, and all the licentiates or probationers who may hereafter be ordained by this presbytery, shall be required, before such licensure and ordination, to receive and accept the Confession of Faith and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church, except the idea of fatality that seems to be taught under the mysterious doctrine of predestination. It is to be understood, however, that such as can clearly receive the Confession of Faith without an exception, will not be required to make any. Moreover, all licentiates, before they are set apart to the whole work of the ministry, or ordained, shall be

required to undergo an examination in English Grammar, Geography, Astronomy, Natural and Moral Philosophy, and Church History. It will not be understood that examinations in Experimental Religion and Theology will be omitted. The presbytery may also require an examination on any part, or all, of the above branches of knowledge before licensure, if they deem it expedient."

Three years after the constitution of the presbytery, the number of ministers and congregations had become so great, that it was divided into three presbyteries, and a synod was formed. The first sessions of the Cumberland Synod were held in October, 1813. At this meeting of the synod a committee was appointed to prepare a Confession of Faith, Catechism, and Form of Church Government, in conformity with the avowed principles of the body. The Confession of Faith and Catechism are a modification of the Westminster Confession, and contain substantially the following doctrines:

That the scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice; that God is an infinite, eternal, and unchangeable spirit, existing mysteriously in three persons, the three being equal in power and glory; that God is the Creator and Preserver of all things; that the decrees of God extend only to what is for his glory; that he has not decreed the existence of sin, because it is neither for his glory nor the good of his creatures; that man was created upright, in the image of God; but, that by the transgression of the federal head, he has become totally depraved, so much so that he can do no good thing without the aid of divine grace. That Jesus Christ is the mediator between God and man; and that he is both God and man in one person; that he obeyed the law perfectly, and died on the cross to make satisfaction for sin; and that, in the expressive language of the apostle, *he tasted death for every man*. That the Holy Spirit is the efficient agent in our conviction, regeneration, and sanctification; that repentance and faith are necessary in order to acceptance, and that both are inseparable from a change of heart; that justification is by faith alone; that sanctification is a progressive work, and not completed till death; that those who believe in Christ, and are regenerated by his Spirit, will never fall away and be lost; that there will be a general resurrection and judgment; and that the righteous will be received to everlasting happiness, and the wicked consigned to everlasting misery.

Cumberland Presbyterians baptize the children of believing parents, and adult persons who have not been baptized in infancy, upon a credible profession of religion. They administer baptism by affusion, and sometimes, when the subject has conscientious preferences, by immersion.

DUTCH REFORMED.

BY W. C. BROWNLEE, D. D.,
OF THE PROTESTANT DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH IN NEW YORK.

IN presenting this brief detail, I shall,

- I. *Give a sketch of the history of our church ;*
- II. *State its doctrines ;*
- III. *Its government ;*
- IV. *Its form of worship ;*
- V. *Its statistics.*

I. The Dutch Reformed Church is the oldest church in the United States which adopts the Presbyterian form of church government. Its history begins with the history of New York and New Jersey. It is a branch of the national Church of Holland ; and is formed exactly on its primitive, simple, and scriptural model, in every point.

The struggle in Holland for religion and liberty was severe and protracted. But, by wisdom and piety in the cabinet, and by a succession of gallant achievements in the field, against the arms of the bigoted and ferocious Spaniard, the Dutch by divine aid secured their national independence and the enjoyment of the Protestant religion. From this era the Dutch became a great and powerful nation. Commerce, literature and religion flourished to an extraordinary degree. And to our days, Holland has been pre-eminently distinguished for her devotion to religion and literature. Hence her primary schools, her academies, her universities, and parochial churches, and hence the number of her learned men, and her pious and devoted ministers in the national church. In the midst of her extensive commercial enterprises she did not lose sight of the Christian duties she owed to those with whom she traded. Her ships, which visited all lands, were instrumental, in the hands of her pious sons, of carrying the glorious gospel to many countries. The East Indies and the adjacent islands, the West Indian Islands, and our own continent, bear lasting

proofs of this in the existing monuments of the fruits of the labours of her missionaries and pious immigrants.

The Dutch West India Company were the first who carried the ministers of the gospel from Holland to our shores. This was done in answer to the petitions of the pious immigrants who had settled in this province, then called New Amsterdam. And as the members of the Dutch West India Company were citizens of Amsterdam, these petitions were, of course, put into the hands of the ministers of that city, as the fittest persons to select good and suitable pastors for the rising churches abroad. By these ministers was the whole management thereof brought before the Classis of Amsterdam; and they promptly undertook the important charge of providing an able ministry for America. The ministers, thus provided, were ordained and sent as missionaries to these shores, by that classis, with the consent and approbation of the Synod of North Holland, to which that classis belonged. And under their paternal and fostering care, and the labour of the able ministers who came among them, these churches grew and increased in number and strength continually.

This minute detail was necessary to throw light on an important matter, out of which arose consequences, in future of the deepest interest to our church. It reveals the reason why the Dutch American churches were brought into such close connexion with the Classis of Amsterdam, and through that classis, with the Synod of North Holland, to the entire exclusion of all the other classes and synods of the national church. And it shows why, in process of time, this connexion brought about the entire dependence, and the implicit subordination of these American Dutch churches to that classis and that synod. So much so, that they *claimed* the entire and exclusive right of selecting, ordaining and sending ministers to these churches. They went farther; they claimed the exclusive power of deciding all ecclesiastical controversies and difficulties which might arise in all the Dutch churches in the provinces.

This was, at first, casually, and by a silent understanding, vested in that classis, by the young and weak churches here, and not objected to by the other synods in Holland, or by the older and more experienced ministers. This dependence was not at first anticipated; and what was only casually allowed, was afterwards claimed by the Classis of Amsterdam with unyielding obstinacy; and it was maintained successfully by a party here, as well as by the members of that classis who had so long held the authority, and who deemed that supervision essential to the well being of the churches here. It is difficult to suppose that such godly ministers as belonged to the Classis

of Amsterdam could wish to retain the reins and authority so stiff over a body of ministers, and over so many churches, whose members were so far removed from and beyond their actual cognizance and supervision. Besides, it was a matter of surprise that they should so long submit to the trouble, and take on them the painful responsibility of regulating the affairs and doings of those churches, whom they could not call before them; and of trying cases in the absence of the accused, and without the benefit of witnesses, unless at great expense and ruinous loss of time to all parties. Besides, had even the Classis of Amsterdam moved, at an early period, the North Synod of Holland to constitute an American classis subordinate and connected, like the other classes of that synod, a vast amount of good would have been gained, and an immense amount of evil avoided. Had that been done at an early day, the two parties, with their great contentions, would never have been known, and the painful divisions and controversies would have been spared to the Reformed Dutch churches, and their reproach among the other denominations and their injury utterly prevented. And had the ministers here united to maintain this happy policy, their good-will would have been induced to yield to their vassalage. But, instead of this, those ministers who came from Holland cherished their home attachments, and maintained the unbounded authority of the old Classis of Amsterdam, who had sent them out, and had loaded them with so many favours, to superintend their churches and to decide on their appeals. They used all their influence to preserve that connexion with the old classis and its vassalage. They represented the American churches as very weak and destitute, and as utterly incapable of acting independent of their ecclesiastical fathers in Holland, and even of supplying their own wants.

It must be admitted that there was the greatest cause of gratitude on the part of the colonial young churches. They had never been weaned, and they were supported chiefly by the old country, not only the churches here, but also those in the East Indies, and in the West India Isles. They had kept up a regular and cheering correspondence; and had lavished their generous charities in making their missionaries comfortable. And those noble deeds the Dutch classis had also extended to the German missions, and especially to the German churches in Pennsylvania. For, through the same classis, were ministers sent from Germany to supply the Dutch settlers in Pennsylvania. And what is most praiseworthy, a fund was formed, and put at the disposal of the classis, to defray the expense of the German missionaries for their journey to Holland and their voyage to America. The Dutch churches here, however, paid the expenses of their own

ministers, and thus left the whole fund at the disposal of the classis for the benefit of the German churches and missionaries.

All these circumstances combined to keep up here a strong party of ministers, who were natives of Holland, in favour of this dependence on Holland, and also to the continuance of their vassalage to the Classis of Amsterdam.

These composed the Conferentie party, who afterwards carried out their peculiar principles so far; they advocated the unlimited power of the fathers in Amsterdam over these churches; they clothed them with something bordering on infallibility. Some of them ventured even to maintain that they were the only legitimate source of ministerial power and authority, and insinuated that no ordination was valid, except it had been performed by the Classis of Amsterdam, or had, at least, its solemn approbation.

Such were the claims of the Conferentie party: and they were maintained by them, in the face of but a very feeble opposition, until the year 1737.*

That feeble opposition came from those who afterwards assumed the name of the Cœtus party. They were willing to yield a just tribute of gratitude, and a definite submission to the church in fatherland. But they had deeply felt the inconvenience and serious difficulties, not to say degradations, of being placed in this implicit subordination and entire control, so inconsistent with the Christian liberty of presbytery. They had been deeply affected with the evils growing out of the mortifying necessity of sending all the cases of ecclesiastical controversy, and difficulties in discipline, to Holland, to be adjudicated there, where none of the parties could be on the spot to give testimony, or plead their own cause. And it was no

* In the violent contentions of those days, this principle was, in no few instances, carried out into actual practice. But it is due to truth to say, that the case of Dominie "Niewenhyt," has not been correctly stated by Smith, in his "History of New York;" and by Dr. Romeyn, in his "Historical Sketch," published in the Christian's Magazine; and by Dr. Gunn, in his "Life of Dr. Livingston."

Dr. Dewitt has, by his researches in the documents preserved in the Dutch, enabled me to correct their errors. This "Niewenhyt" at Albany, was in fact, Dominie "Nieuwenhuysen," of the church of New York. Nicholas Van Rensselaer came over under the auspices of the popish Duke of York, and was suspected, at the time, of coming into this new province to further the cause of Popery. But Dominie N. took this fair and justifiable ground, that "although Van Rensselaer, having the license and ordination from the English bishop of Salisbury, was truly invested with the office of the Christian ministry: yet, nevertheless, this gave him no claim, nor qualification whatever, to settle as a pastor in the Dutch Reformed Church." Hence he resisted Van Rensselaer's settlement in the Dutch Church in Albany, although he was summoned to answer for his conduct, before the Erastian governor and council.

small ground of complaint, that parents must be subjected to the painful separation, for years, from their sons sent to Holland for education for the ministry ; not to mention the burden of expense to which they were also subjected, by sending abroad those who were educated here, to be ordained in Holland to the holy ministry. In a word, the Conferentie party maintained the high importance of Holland education, and ventured to uphold the exclusive validity of Holland license, and Holland ordination. The Cætus party advocated the necessity of a home education, a home license, and a home ordination. These, they said, were equally good for them, and equally valid for every purpose, as those in fatherland.

This may be considered the first period of the Dutch Reformed Church in this land. It extends from the first organization of the church, unto the year 1664, when the province was invaded and seized by a British army, and placed under the government of the Duke of York and Albany, who was afterwards James II., and who abdicated the British throne.

During this period, the church of New Amsterdam, now New York, was established; also, the church in Albany, in Flatbush, in New Utrecht, in Flatlands, and Esopus, now Kingston. The collegiate church of New York was organized as early, it is believed, as 1619. This is so stated in a manuscript of the late Dr. Livingston, on traditionary documents. And in another, he stated that a document is still extant, containing the names of members of that church, in 1622.* In the sketch of the history of the Dutch Church by Dr. Romeyn,† it is conjectured that the collegiate church was organized first. But Dr. Livingston, in one of his manuscripts, has said that "in Albany they had ministers as early as any in New York, if not before them." The *authentic* records, now in possession of the collegiate church, commence in the year 1639, and in them we find the acts of the Consistory, and bating some omissions, a list of ministers, elders, and deacons, with the members, together with the baptisms, and marriages, from that period. And these records have been continued down to this day.

The first minister in New York was the Rev. Everardus Bogardus, whose descendants are among us at this day. It would appear that he had been a pastor for a long period ; but we can find no correct date of his arrival here, nor the length of the time of his ministry. There is a tradition, among his descendants, that he became blind, and returned to Holland. This may in part be true ; for I am in-

* Dr. Gunn's *Life of Dr. Livingston*, pp. 79, 81.

† In the *Christian's Magazine*.

debted to my colleague Dr. Dewitt for the fact, that in returning to Holland, in the same ship with Gov. Kiest, he was shipwrecked and lost with the rest. We find the names of only two Dominies between him and the capture of the city in 1664: these were I. and S. Megapolensis. The latter was a practising physician, as well as a minister.

The first place of worship, erected by the colony, in the New Netherlands, has generally been supposed to be that small edifice which stood close down on the water's edge, and within the fort of New Amsterdam, and on the place now called the Battery. But I am indebted to my colleague Dr. Knox, and the distinguished antiquarian Mr. Rapelje, for the fact, that the first church of Christ was reared on a spot near the lower end of Stone Street. That in the fort was the second, and was erected in 1642. This was, in process of time, transferred to the site on which the late Garden Street Church stood. The church erected by Gov. Stuyvesant, on his farm, or as it is styled in Dutch, his Bowery, was probably the next. But no true dates can be discovered, or correct list of his chaplains. The celebrated Henry Solyns was one of them; he also ministered in the Dutch Church in Brooklyn.*

The second period of the Dutch Church extends from the surrender of the province in 1664 to 1693. The condition of the church was now materially changed, as might be anticipated. The English strove to shear it of its glory as *the church* of the province, and the grand branch of the national Church of Holland. But the Dutch, at the surrender in 1664, and more fully in the treaty of peace, concluded in 1676, had taken care to secure their spiritual rights. It was expressly stipulated that the rights of conscience, with regard to worship and discipline, should be secured to the Dutch inhabitants. It may appear strange that this high privilege should have been granted to the Dutch here, at that time, when a furious persecution was carried on by the brother of James, Charles II., against the Scottish Covenanters, and their nation. But it is to be remembered, that James, Duke of York and Albany, was a decided and even bigoted Roman Catholic. And the Papists were themselves, at that time, under severe laws and penalties, depriving them of liberty of conscience. James had been striving to obtain *toleration* for others, that he might obtain it for those of his own creed. Hence he had taken

* Henry Solyns was a most amiable, learned, and accomplished Dutchman. He retired to Holland early in life, at the earnest request of his aged father, who was anxious to embrace him before he died. A Latin poem by him, addressed to the venerable Cotton Mather, on the appearance of his great work, "*Magnalia Americana*," is still extant in some of the editions of the learned New Englander's work.

care to grant the rights of conscience to the Dutch, with a view to open the way for the Roman Catholics. His bigotry wrought this one good result.

Under this sacred grant, the Dutch Church maintained still a high ascendancy. The mass of the population belonged to her; the members were among the most wealthy and influential individuals in the colony; and the distinguished Governor Stuyvesant, and the great officers of the former government, were elders and members in full communion. She was not only the predominant, but, beyond any comparison, the most respectable church in the whole colony. Owing to this influence, and the mild sway of the British, the Dutch Church still kept up her correspondence with the Classis of Amsterdam; she still owned its full power and authority. And that classis and the North Synod still exercised their former care and power over all ecclesiastical matters, here, as formerly.

During this period, we must notice a certain assumption of power by the oldest churches of New York, Albany, and Esopus, now Kingston. As new churches sprung up in the vicinity of each of these, the ministers of these old and powerful establishments claimed and exercised a superintending power over all these country churches. This, by some, has been deemed not quite consistent with the strict course of Presbyterian church power. But it was exactly similar to what occurred in the days of the Scottish Reformer, John Knox. They had in those days their *superintendents*,* who visited vacant churches, and formed new churches; and directed preachers on their route of missionary duty. But they never acted as diocesan bishops over other officiating pastors. It was assumed in Scotland and in this province, to meet the extraordinary wants of a people calling loudly for pastors to break the bread of life to them. These wants the old Dominies laboured to supply, in the absence of a sufficient number of pastors. And if they considered it an infringement on their prerogatives if any minister ventured to officiate in these churches without their approbation: it was no severer, nor a more improper rule on their part, than the salutary rule now existing with the strictest propriety in each of our classes; namely, that no strange minister, nor itinerant preacher, shall preach in any of our vacant churches, without the approbation and leave of a committee of ministers, appointed as a species of superintendents. Such was the state of the Dutch Church at this period. It was eminently distinguished by its

* The English word for bishops; I mean strictly scriptural bishop, not diocesan bishops, —a human invention, originated by human power in the church.

numbers, wealth and piety; and such was its flourishing condition until 1693.

The third period of our church extends from 1693 to 1737. That jealousy and spirit of exclusiveness, which has characterized one branch of the Reformed churches, now began to put itself forward in a formidable manner, against the equal rights of the Dutch Church and other denominations. This was no less than a too successful attempt, by English influence, to place the Episcopal Church on a civil establishment. These plans of the English people were not concealed. They seemed to be resolved to create a union of church and state, and to give a civil establishment to Episcopacy in all the British provinces. It was attempted, mainly, in Virginia and New York. That sect was to be the exclusive church,—*the Church*. And all the citizens were to be taxed for its support; and all other Christians were gravely pronounced to be “dissenters,” from “the Church.”*

Previous to the times of the bigoted Gov. Fletcher, a delightful courtesy and Christian intercourse prevailed between the Dutch Church and the Episcopalian Church. It is refreshing to us, who live in these times, which may be called the *terrapin age* of exclusiveness and bigotry, to recall its memory.

It is a fact, that the first rector of Trinity Church, in New York was inducted into office, December 1697, in the Dutch Church in Garden Street; and it is equally a fact, that the distinguished Dominie Henry Solyns, the pastor of the Dutch Church, and Dominie J. P. Nucella, of Kingston, did actually officiate on this important occasion! And that Rev. Rector, Mr. Vesey, officiated in the Garden

* Some are still so bigoted as to allow themselves to violate the feelings of their fellow-Christians, by denominating those “dissenters,” who do not worship in their church. This might have received some countenance on the part of those who enjoyed the palmy days of a civil establishment here. But, inasmuch as we obtained, by the glorious and successful war of the American revolution, this extraordinary boon, along with our civil liberties—namely, a full and complete deliverance from a civil establishment of the Episcopal Church: we cannot possibly conceive any reason, on the part of any man, who has heard of the said revolution, and the breaking down thereby of that civil establishment—why we should be called dissenters!

But, we only state historical facts when we say, the Episcopalians are the dissenters. They are dissenters from the famous Reformed Churches of France, of Holland, of Germany, of Switzerland, of Scotland; and all their other Presbyterian brethren in Ireland and the United States. They are, moreover, dissenters from the Waldenses, Albigenses, and the ancient British Christians, called Culdees, who sustained the true primitive apostolical churches in England, until the sixth century; and who withstood Popery in Ireland and Scotland, until the year 1172. These were, strictly speaking, Presbyterians. See the History of the Culdees, by Dr. Jamieson, jointly with Sir Walter Scott, quarto, Edinburgh; and the History of the Waldenses, &c., by John Paul Perrin; also by Sir Samuel Moreland; and Sager’s *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises*.

Street Church, alternately with the Dutch, until Trinity Church was finished !

In 1779, this minute is found on the records of the Trinity Church : "It being represented that the old Dutch church is now used as an hospital for his majesty's troops, this corporation, impressed with a grateful remembrance of the former kindness of the members of that ancient church, do offer them the use of St. George's Church to that congregation for celebrating divine worship." It was gratefully accepted, and a vote of thanks was kindly offered in return, for the use of that church. I delight to add, that Gov. Burnet, the son of the illustrious historian, and Bishop Burnet, presented an organ to the Dutch Church in Garden Street. It was destroyed during the revolutionary war.

How different were those sweet and palmy days of true Christian fellowship and delicious charity, from our iron times, when bigots call all men "dissenters," who cannot stoop to laud "high churchism," "Puseyism," and "Popery;" and when fanatics gravely profess to leave all other Christians "to God's uncovenanted mercy," who are under the ministry of Christ, not ordained by "a diocesan bishop:" an officer in the church, whom God Almighty never ordained !

This encroachment of intolerance and bigotry was originated, ostensibly, by the folly of Gov. Fletcher. His project was brought forward and urged with the unusual intolerance of the age. He was a man of inordinate warmth and boldness, and withal a bigoted Episcopalian, even to a degree of fanaticism. He knew *no* other church; with him *no* man merited the name of Christian, who was not of his *sect*; and there was no recognised ministry or sacraments but of *his* church. He was a thorough disciple of Laud. There was an air of bigotry in all this scheme. The Episcopalians were a mere handful, compared to the great masses of the population, and they were chiefly in the city of New York, and some were scattered over the adjacent counties, and they consisted chiefly of the officers of government, their dependents, and the military. These were "the church." And the idea of establishing *these* into a church, to be supported by taxes levied on the mass of the people, was so unjust, so unreasonable, and so absurd, that no one but Gov. Fletcher could have entertained it soberly for a single moment. Hence the house of assembly resisted him, and declared the project wicked and absurd. Resistance only warms bigotry and rouses fanaticism into ardour. He never lost sight of his project. But he exercised all the arts of Jesuitism to carry his point: some of the members he flattered and cajoled; some he imposed on by fallacious promises; some he threatened and bullied

into compliance. At last, the assembly, with extreme reluctance, yielded to his plan, and, in 1693, passed an act establishing the Episcopal Church in the city and county of New York, and in the counties of West Chester, Richmond, and Queen's. And the hand of the astute Jesuit was visible in the drawing of the act, and in the cunning management of the whole affair. The inhabitants of these counties and the city were instructed to choose ten vestrymen and two churchwardens. The Dutch Church and Presbyterians had no elder or deacon to mingle with the above "apostolic number," and these twelve officials of Gov. Fletcher were to have all the appointing power of the ministry who were to officiate. It is very true, the act did not precisely specify that the clergy should be of the Episcopal order, and no other. The half unwilling and long reluctant assembly, left this open. There was even an "explanatory act" got up some time afterwards, declaring that "dissenting ministers might be chosen." But this was quite a harmless enactment, to which the bigoted governor cheerfully lent his signature. For he was certain that all was safe, and that no dissenting minister, that is, no "unordained" clergyman, could be chosen by his devoted and equally bigoted vestrymen. And this was, in fact, the case. No minister of the Dutch or Presbyterian Church was ever chosen to officiate.

Thus, from 1693 to 1776, that is, for eighty-three years, the Dutch, English, and Scotch Churches, and all other non-Episcopalian inhabitants of the city and county of New York, Queen's, Richmond, and West Chester counties, were placed under a galling yoke. Besides supporting their own ministers, they were forced by an unrighteous law to support, by taxes levied on them, the small sect of the Episcopalians! And it was only by the glorious war and deliverance of the revolution, that the people were set free from the union of church and state; and from the establishment of a peculiar sect of religion in these United States.

During this civil establishment, many who sought the "loaves and the fishes," left the communion of the Presbyterian and Dutch Churches, and went into the favoured society. For, in every religious society there are many individuals, who are ready to join a dominant party, where they can enjoy the favour of the rulers, and be in the way of appointments to office; and also be freed from the expense pressed on dissenters. But the result, on the whole, was not unfavourable to the *spiritual* interests of the Dutch Church. She lost only, generally speaking, the worldly men, and some turbulent members who loved not the pure and strict discipline of the church. In this period the doctrines of grace were faithfully preached, and

divine ordinances administered in purity. The ministry, with some few exceptions, were learned, exemplary, and indefatigable; and the great body of the population, regular and moral, and attached to the church of their Dutch fathers, which had been so long preserved, without interruption, and with little opposition.

The fourth period of the Dutch Reformed Church extends from 1737 to 1771. It opened with a new and important movement. Hitherto the ascendancy of the Holland courts had remained unimpaired in our churches here. For, although many were obviously opposed to this state of things, and the opponents were daily increasing: still their movements were secret, and their opposition spent itself in words. Hence no decided measure had been resorted to, in order to remove this state of dependence and its manifold evils.

In 1737, the first movement was made by five prominent ministers, Messrs. G. Dubois, Haeghoort, B. Freeman, Van Santford, and Curtenius. They did not venture to adopt the bold measure of renouncing the abject dependence on the parent classis. They merely proposed to form an assembly for counsel and free internal intercourse, and any ecclesiastical business, not inconsistent with this dependence on Holland. This they called a *cætus*. A plan was adopted, and rules formed for its regulation; and it was sent down to the churches for their concurrence. On the 27th of April, 1738, the day appointed by the five ministers to receive the reports from the churches, a convocation of ministers and elders met in New York.*

The several reports of the churches induced the convention to adopt the plan without opposition; and it was sent to the Classis of Amsterdam for their ratification. This, they presumed they should promptly obtain. For there was nothing in the projected *cætus* which did, in fact, really curtail any of the power of that classis. Yet it was not until ten years after this that they received an answer, by the Rev. Mr. Van Sinderin, from Holland; for it was in the month of May, 1747, that the convention was summoned to receive the answer of the classis, which, though a long delay, gave its entire

* The following are the names of these eminent men:—the Rev. G. Dubois, and the elders, Anthony Rutgers, and Abraham Lefferts; the Rev. Mr. Freeman, and the elders, Peter Nevius, and Dirk Brinkerhoef; the Rev. Mr. Van Santford, and the Elder Goosen Adriance; the Rev. Mr. Haeghoort, and the Elder Van Dyck; the Rev. Mr. Curtenius, of Hackensack, and his elder, Mr. Zabriskie; the Rev. Theodorus J. Frelinghuysen, of Raritan, (a most distinguished man of God, and greatly blessed in his ministerial labours; he had five sons, ministers; and two daughters, married to ministers,) and the Elder H. Fisher; the Rev. Mr. Ericksen, and the Elder J. Zutveen; the Rev. Mr. Bohm, of Philadelphia, with the elder, Mr. — Snyder; the Rev. Mr. Schuyler, of Schoharie, with the elder, Mr. — Spies.

approbation and concurrence. On the appointed day only six ministers were present. These having received the act of the classis, did nothing more than issue their call of the first meeting of the cœtus, on the second Tuesday of September, 1747, in the city of New York.

On the day appointed the representatives of the churches met in cœtus; and, although the plan had received the full approbation of the mother church, still there was a most decided opposition to it. This opposition was made by Dominie Boel, of the church of New York, and by Mr. Mancius of Kingston, Mr. Freyenmoet, and Mr. Martse-lius. Mr. Frelinghuysen could not prevail with his church to accede to the cœtus; but it received his own decided support. And it was soon ascertained that those who opposed the whole of this narrow and inefficient scheme, were correct; whatever may have been their avowed motives. It effected no good purpose which could not have been done without it. It was a meeting merely for fraternal intercourse and advice. This could have been attained without a formal cœtus. It gave the pastors no powers; they could not meet as bishops, who had each their church; they had no power to ordain ministers; they could try no cases requiring ecclesiastical investigation; they could not even settle ecclesiastical disputes, without the usual consent of the Classis of Amsterdam. Its utter unfitness to promote the interests of the church became apparent to all, except those in the slavish interests of fatherland. Nothing but an independent classis could do this. They must have power to ordain; they must have their own court to try cases. The church was suffering exceedingly, said those who had got a cœtus, but wished a cœtus clothed with the power of a classis. But this met with a renewed, fierce opposition. “Shall *we* throw off the care and paternal supervision of the Classis of Amsterdam? Shall *we* venture to ordain ministers? Shall *we* set up ourselves as judges? Where can *we* get such learned ministers as those from Holland? And can any of *us* judge of their fitness, and learning, and piety?” Such was the feeling and declamation of the Conferentie party.

On the contrary, the Cœtus party appealed to their brethren on the necessity of having youth trained here for the ministry. “We must have academies and a college. The English language is advancing on us: we must have a ministry to preach in English, or our youth will abandon us in a body. And the expense of sending for ministers is becoming oppressive; not to speak of the great expense and privation sustained by us who are parents, in sending our sons to Holland to be educated, so as to be able to preach in Dutch. And you all know,” they added, “how many years have sometimes elapsed between the time of a call sent to fatherland, and the coming of a pas-

tor ; and sometimes churches have been disappointed entirely. None have responded to their call. And even, in certain cases, some ministers have come out who were not only unpopular, but absolutely disagreeable. Is it not unendurable, that the churches should have no choice of their pastor ? Men, accustomed to a national church and its high-handed measures have come among us, who have, of course, views and habits entirely different from those of our fellow-citizens and Christians in Holland. Need we remind you of the distractions and divisions caused by these obstinate men, who, instead of harmonizing with the people, and winning their confidence, have imprudently opposed them, and rendered their ministry odious and unsuccessful ? Besides, is it not humiliating and degrading to these churches, and to us all, that we should be deprived of the power of ordaining ministers ? And we must send abroad for ministers, as if none here were fit to minister in holy things ! It is an imputation on our sons ; it is an imputation on us, in the ministry here ; as if *they* were unfit for the holy work, and as if *we* had only *half* of the ministerial office ! We declare this bondage to be no longer tolerable, and it ought no longer to be endured."

Such was the bold language now used by the Cœtus party, both ministers and laymen. And as a goodly number had, by the permission of the Classis of Amsterdam, been ordained, by *special favour*, all these, to a man, took a bold stand against this dependence on Holland. They never felt that attachment to the classis, which bound down, in slavish attachment, those whom it had sent out hither. They had no prejudices ; they saw the painful grievances under which their fathers smarted ; and they felt the power of the arguments and appeals, so urgently pressed by all, to seek an independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction of their own. They spoke out with warmth on the subject. They even ventured to charge the church of their forefathers with injustice to the ministry here, and actual tyranny over them. They withheld what Christ, the King of Zion, never authorized them to withhold from the true ministry. They demanded of her to do them and herself justice, by conveying to them all the powers of the ministry, which she had received, as it respected doctrine, and sacraments, and discipline.

All these appeals made a most powerful impression on the people. Many churches came over to their measures ; and even a few of the European ministers candidly acceded. And they no longer concealed their fixed determination to commence a system of measures to withdraw these American churches from this abject subordination to the Classis of Amsterdam and the Synod of North Holland.

This plan was matured in 1754. In the cœtus of the preceding year a motion had been entertained to amend the plan of the cœtus, by converting it into a regular classis, with all its proper powers. A plan was drafted for this purpose; adopted with great unanimity by those present; and formally transmitted to the churches for their concurrence.

Upon this there commenced a scene of animosity, division, and actual violence, compared to which, all the former wranglings were utterly nothing. It was the beginning of a war waged for *fifteen* years with unmitigated fury! The Conferentie party met and organized themselves into a firm body of opposition in 1755. They were the following:—Dominies Ritzma and Deronde, of the church of New York; Curtenius, Haeghoort, Vanderlinde, Van Sinderin, Schuyler, Rubel, Kock, Kerr, Rysdyck, and Freyenmoet. The Cœtus party embraced all the rest, whose names are given in a preceding note, with the exception of the above names. These formed two hostile bodies resolutely pitted against each other, and apparently resolved never to yield. The peace of neighbourhoods was disturbed; families were divided; churches torn by factions. Houses of worship were locked up by one faction against the other. Tumults and disgraceful scenes frequently occurred on the holy sabbath, and at the doors of churches. Ministers were occasionally assaulted in the very pulpit; and sometimes the solemn worship of God was disturbed and actually terminated by mob-violence. In these scenes the Conferentie party were usually noted as the most violent and outrageous. But, on both sides, a furious zeal prompted many to shameful excesses, and a most painful disgrace of the Christian name.

The more moderate and prudent deplored these evils and growing mischiefs, but they could find no remedy. No individual, no body of Christian men, was found to act as mediator. The two parties would listen to no overtures. Humble Christians wept over the revolting scenes, and the impending ruin of their church; hope deserted their fainting hearts; and many of them retired, from such unhallowed scenes, to the bosom of a peaceful and Christian communion in other churches.

The Conferentie party called in the aid of the Holland Church. They addressed a letter to the Classis of Amsterdam, in 1755; a second one in 1756; a third in 1760; a fourth in 1761. In these they uttered their inflammatory complaints, that the American churches were attempting to throw off their submission to their lawful authority, and to form an independent body, with powers equal to those of the mother church! And in reply to these, too

many of the ministers of that classis lent their aid to foment fresh troubles, and defeat the efforts of the church to become independent of them.

When this violent schism took place, the two parties of Cœtus and Conferentie, were nearly equal in point of numbers. But there was a marked difference in their character, and the spirit of their preaching. The Conferentie pastors were men of greater learning, but they were cold, and heavy, and spiritless. Their discourses had more of the air of a professor's lecture from the chair, than of a popular and heart-stirring address to a mixed audience. The Cœtus party were zealous, ardent, practical in their popular addresses, and indefatigable in their pastoral duties. Hence they soon had the mass of the pious people with them, who applauded them and sustained them in their trials and labours of love, while the unsound and heartless vehemently opposed them. The anecdote told of that devoted and pious Dominie, Dr. Meyer, of Esopus, now Kingston, will illustrate this. He had one sabbath preached the holy doctrine of regeneration by the Holy Ghost, its true nature, and its necessity, and he had closed with a heart-searching examination of the souls of his audience, giving marks of its existence in them, and the evidences of their *not* having the new birth. When he came down from the pulpit, one of the elders refused to give him, as usual, the right hand of fraternal recognition and approbation, as is the delightful custom in our church. "Ah! Dominie," cried he, "I cannot give you my hand of approbation; I cannot stand that, flesh and blood cannot endure that doctrine!" "True, very true," said Dr. Meyer,—“therefore is it the more manifestly Christ's holy doctrine; and therefore do I cease not to preach it.” Many such scenes occurred in those days of dissension in the churches.

During this period, another painful source of difficulties occurred, which caused to our church the loss of many most valuable families. I allude to the introduction of preaching in English in the churches. The English had been, for a century, the language of the government, its officers, and influential men. It was evident to the great mass of the Dutch youth, that it must, in the issue, be the language of the country. Causes were tried in English—all the pleadings were in English. The youth mingled with increasing multitudes of youth, who spoke nothing but English; and the best education in the city, and in the neighbouring colleges, was all conducted in English. Hence the youth of both sexes laboured to be master of English. In the progress of years, the great body of the youth could not understand a sermon in Dutch. They demanded English preaching. All

the more prudent, and all, who by a wise forecast, saw the utter desertion of the Dutch churches by the youth, in the course of another generation at least, unless English preaching were introduced, united their efforts with the youth, and urged the necessity of having English preaching forthwith, as well as Dutch preaching. This was long and keenly resisted. Those whose spirits had been so long sharpened by the vehement contentions of the home and foreign parties, alluded to by us, carried an unusual warmth, and obstinate pertinacity, into this new conflict. The youth and their friends did not, perhaps, use the necessary soothing spirit of persuasion. They saw the justness of this requirement so clearly, that they had not the necessary patience to bear with the venerable men who clung to their dear, their own native tongue—the language of dear old Holland—which they so tenderly loved. To take from them their *native tongue* seemed to them as being driven into exile, among men whose tongue was to them barbarous! It was a hard struggle. But the venerable consistory of the church of New York were constrained at last to yield. For they loved their church, they loved their dear children; and they saw many of them already gone to other denominations, where they could understand the speakers. Yet, even this compliance made us lose a goodly number of the old people and younger heads of families. And they were without any reasonable excuse. For they understood the English as well as the Dutch. But they left their fathers' church, because they failed in their effort at victory! And, hence, not a few made this remark, as they retired into the Episcopal Church,—“Well, since we must have English, let us go where we shall get the language in the purest form!”

This was not the first movement in our church to secure English preaching. My colleague, Dr. Dewitt, who is now preparing a full history of the Dutch Reformed Church, has drawn my attention to a fact not generally known. It is this: about the middle of the seventeenth century, a formal request was sent by our church, to Holland, for a Dominie to be a colleague to Dominie Megapolensis, who should also preach to the people in English. In answer to this was Dominie Drisius (in Dutch, Dries,) sent out. He arrived in 1653. He had been a pastor in the Dutch Reformed Church in the city of London. He preached in Dutch, in English, and in French.*

* This excellent and indefatigable pastor officiated frequently on the north side of Staten Island, in French, in a church formed there, in that French settlement. These were Huguenots, who were driven from France, at the revoking of the edict of Nantz, by the inhuman tyrant Louis XIV. These eminent sufferers for Christ's cause and crown, afterwards united with their brethren, the Dutch, and formed that church which

But the first man who preached exclusively in English, in the collegiate church, was the Rev. Dr. Laidlie. He was a native of the South of Scotland, a graduate of Edinburgh University. He had been a pastor of the Church of Flushing, in Zealand, in Holland. From that he was called by the consistory, and he arrived and entered on his ministry in 1764.* His first sermon I have read in manuscript. His text was, 2 Cor. v. 11: "Knowing the terrors of the Lord, we persuade men." It was preached to an immense audience. And a signal revival of religion soon commenced under his zealous ministration, and the church greatly flourished. I have heard some of the aged people tell this anecdote of him. On a certain occasion, when he had, in a prayer meeting, uttered a fervent and heavenly prayer, the aged people gathered round him, and said—"Ah! Dominie, many an earnest prayer did we offer up in *Dutch*, for your coming among us; and, truly, the Lord has answered us in *English*, and has sent you to us!"

The members of the Cœtus party had, in view of forming an independent ecclesiastical constitution, for some time turned their earnest attention to the establishment of a seminary for the education of the future ministry, at home. And they had communicated this intention to the Classis of Amsterdam. The late Dr. Livingston, being at that time in Holland, pursuing his studies, had entered zealously into the plan of promoting this double project. He had gained the approbation of many of the principal ministers in Holland, to the purpose of forming an ecclesiastical constitution in America, similar to that of fatherland. This consent, it seems, was sought and gained, in order, if possible, to induce the brethren of the conferentie to unite with them in the enterprise; for they would do nothing without that consent. And this consent of the enlightened ministers of Holland prescribed an express condition, which was precisely what the brethren of the cœtus wished for, and anticipated. It was expressly required that the American church should proceed to make an immediate and adequate provision for a theological professorate. For they assured the American brethren that they could not maintain any relation with

continues and flourishes there to this day, near Port Richmond. And the numerous prominent men there, still bear the honoured name of their noble progenitors, the Huguenots, who suffered the loss of their country, their property, and every thing but their Christian honour and religion! And they are dear unto us for their fathers' sake.

* Dr. Laidlie was an amiable and very accomplished gentleman, a devotedly pious Christian, a popular, evangelical, and zealous preacher; of unusual dignity, and commanding eloquence in the pulpit. This is the character of Dr. Laidlie, as drawn by his, then, young colleague, Dr. Livingston. Dr. L. died in 1778, at Red Hook, in his exile from his church, caused by the British army, which then occupied New York.

a church, who neglected to secure a thorough education for the youth, seeking the holy ministry. Yet even this did not conciliate the conferentie. They utterly opposed every plan which would cut off their dependence on Holland, or would go to introduce any ministers but those educated in fatherland, in Dutch !

Several schemes were proposed. One was, that a local union should be formed on the part of the cœtus with the flourishing College of Princeton. This seemed to be the first and favourite scheme of Dr. Livingston, while he was in Holland, in consequence of a consultation he had with the venerable Dr. Witherspoon, at that time on a visit to Holland, previously to his coming to Princeton. This was opposed by the cœtus, and also by the Classis of Amsterdam. Another plan was, to have a theological professorship in King's College, now Columbia College, in New York.* This was objected to by both parties. The cœtus, speaking the sentiment of the great body of the people, said, "No, we shall be independent of Holland, and of every other body, here. We must have a college and a theological school of our own." And with a noble and pious resolution, they gained their grand object. A college was founded called "Queen's College," after the queen of King George III., a High-Dutch princess, who, it was understood, would kindly patronize it. The charter of this college was dated in 1770; and it was "instituted for the education of the youth in the learned languages, the liberal and useful arts and sciences, and especially in divinity."

This noble step in the advancement of the church, which ought to have been hailed by every friend of the Dutch Church, was the signal for a fresh outburst of the war of opposition on the part of the brethren of the conferentie; and to such an extent was this unnatural war carried on in the bosom of the church, that it began to excite alarm for the very existence of the Dutch Church. Reflecting and pious men now apprehended that she must soon sink into insignificance, and by degrees be absorbed by the surrounding denominations, and cease to exist as a distinct church in this land !

The churches of New York and of Albany were the two who kept aloof from this distressing party warfare, and were styled *neutrals*. Two of the dominies of New York, namely, Messrs. De Ronde and Ritzema, were strong partisans. The former was the most ardent in opposing English preaching; the latter, in stoutly defending the principles of the conferentie. He and the learned

* Those who have looked into the charter of this venerable college, among others my colleague, Dr. Knox, one of the trustees, are of opinion that the Dutch are entitled to a professorate in this college.

Dominic Leydt, of New Brunswick, were perhaps the ablest writers on this long and vexed question. The latter was a masterly writer in defence of the *cœtus*.

The fifth period in the history of our church, extending from 1771 to 1784, opened with the best prospects. It was like the bright rising of the sun, after a long, dreary, and most melancholy winter. It brought peace, harmony, and prosperity to the churches, in the healing of the division between the *cœtus* and *conferentie*.

The fervent prayers of God's people had never ceased to ascend to heaven for this object, even in our darkest days; and divine Providence wrought a great deliverance. The happy instruments were the late Dr. Livingston and those eminent men in New York with whom he corresponded, particularly Abraham Lott, by whom he was regularly advised of the state of affairs going on here. This great and good man of God felt deeply for the church, and was resolved to lose no opportunity of engaging the whole influence of his friends in Holland, to put an end to these most unnatural and painful scenes. He was convinced that the brethren of the *conferentie* would yield readily to what the Classis of Amsterdam would enjoin on them. Hence his first object was to induce the North Synod to appoint that classis the standing committee, with full powers to transact the affairs of the American church. He waited on that synod at its meeting at Edam, in 1769, and, through the influence of prominent members, he gained his point without any opposition.

Having thus got the whole power into the hands of that classis, his next object was to prevail with the classis to accede to the plan proposed by the *cœtus*. He placed before them the arguments employed for years by those brethren here, and urged on them the necessity of giving the church here the power to ordain as well as educate her own ministry. He succeeded completely. For such were the candour, the piety, and the liberal views of the Holland ministers, when the whole matters in controversy were fairly and fully set before them, that they no longer resisted the most righteous claims. And by the kindness of God, who watches over his church and moves the hearts of all men, a liberal plan was arranged: general principles were adopted to remove the existing difficulties; to conciliate the contending parties; to take measures to provide a well-educated ministry; and secure the necessary and unshackled right to license and ordain their own ministers.

Having finished his studies, and having taken the degree of Doctor in Divinity after a rigid examination, Dr. Livingston returned home

in 1770, and accepted the call presented to him from the Collegiate Church. He lost no time in gradually winning over influential and good men to the plan of conciliation, which he had brought with him. In 1771 he induced the consistory of his church to call a convention. There was not a more likely mode of succeeding. That consistory and church had unbounded influence with all the pastors and churches. The fraternal call was promptly responded to, and in October, 1771, the convention met in New York. It was a full meeting, and it displayed a kind temper and evangelical spirit. Ministers and elders there met in cordiality, who had not met nor spoken to each other for years! This disappointed the enemy, and filled with joy the hearts of God's children. The Holy Spirit seemed to pervade the assembly, and shed peace and love in the hearts of all, in answer to the fervent prayers offered up.*

The first business was to appoint a large committee of the most distinguished persons to mature a plan of union and church government. The committee was a most judicious one; it consisted of six

* The following were the members of this famous convention :

MINISTERS.	ELDERS.	PLACES.
John N. Livingston,	Is. Roosevelt,	New York.
Lambertus De Ronde,	Jacobus Van Santen,	"
Archibald Laidlie,	C. Sebring,	"
	E. Byvank,	"
Eilardus Westerlo,	N. Gansevoort,	Albany.
John Leydt,	Hendrick Fischer,	New Brunswick.
Jo. Casper Rubbell,	Englebert Lott,	King's County, Long Island.
Ulpianus Van Sinderin,	J. Rapeljie,	"
Warmuldus Kuypers,	G. De Murray,	Hackensack.
Jacobus R. Hardenberg,	C. Vander Meulen,	Raritan, (Somerville.)
Isaac Rysdyck,	Richard Snedecker,	Poughkeepsie and Fishkill.
Martinus Schoonmaker,	John Sickles,	Gravesend and Haerlem.
Samuel Ver Breyck,	Rulof Van Houten,	Toppan.
	Jacobus Elting,	Kingston.
	Adrian Wynkoop,	"
John Schunema,		Kaatskill and Cocksackie.
William Jackson,	Abraham Sickles,	Bergen and Staten Island.
Hermanus Meyer,		Pompton.
Dirck Romeyn,	L. Pawlin,	Marbletown and Mombachus.
J. M. Van Harlingen,	Jacobus Van Arsdalen,	Millston and Shannock.
J. H. Goetschius,	Peter Zabriskie,	Hackensack and Schralenberg
	D. Herring,	"
Garrit Leydecker,	Michael Moor,	English Neighbourhood.
David Morinus,	G. Tingens,	Ackquakenonk.
Cornelius Dubois,	A. Zipkens,	Freehold and Middletown.
.	Adolphus Meyer,	Haerlem.
Benjamin Vanderlinden,	Stephen Zabriskie,	Paramus.

ministers and as many elders. Dr. Livingston and Dr. Westerlo, with the Elders I. Roosevelt and N. Gansevoort, were appointed to represent the two great churches that had been neutrals in the violent contest, namely, those of New York and Albany; the Rev. Dr. Hardenberg, Mr. Ver Breyck, and the Elders H. Fischer and P. Zabriskie, to represent the Cœtus party; and the Rev. Messrs. Rysdyck and De Ronde, with the Elders J. Van Santen and R. Sne-decker, to represent the Conferentie party.

As soon as this committee met, Dr. Livingston laid before them the plan which he had brought with him from Holland, and which he had hitherto shown to no one. The scheme embraced three important objects: First, The internal arrangements, church government, and all the usual powers of a classis. Second, The measures best calculated to heal all animosities and divisions. Third, The conducting of a correspondence with the parent church of Holland. It met with the kindest reception in the committee. After a few additions and amendments were proposed, it was adopted, and brought forward to the convention. Here it was again fully discussed with the best feelings. The members on each side seemed to vie with the other in applauding it; and finally it was adopted without one dissenting vote! It now only needed the final approbation of the Classis of Amsterdam. Accordingly, it was transmitted to them. And the convention adjourned, to meet in October, 1772, to receive their final answer. That answer came, conveying to their dear American brethren the fullest and most perfect approbation of the union, and all the measures adopted, and concluded with their fervent prayers for the prosperity of the American church. The convention heard the letter with emotions of joy and gratitude, and it was with the greatest cordiality signed by every member of the meeting, while they praised God for the happy consummation!

The most distinguished promoters of the union, and the independence of our church, were these: Dr. Laidlie, and Dr. Livingston of New York; Dr. Westerlo, of Albany; Dr. Romeyn, of Schenectady; Dr. Hardenberg, (afterwards the first president of Queen's College,) and Mr. Leydt, of New Brunswick; Mr. Breyck, of Tappan; and Mr. Rysdyck, of Poughkeepsie. This distinguished man had all along been a keen conferentie partisan. But as soon as he heard the wise and fraternal plan of union, he cordially gave it his support, and brought his friends and people over to the same course.

The establishment of a college now occupied the earnest attention of the united and peaceful church, and particularly to secure a theological professor. But from the date of their charter to the close of

the war of the revolution, little was done for the furtherance of an object so dear to the church. This was on account of the poverty of the country, and deplorable calamities of the war. Besides, many were inclined to keep the theological professorate distinct from the college. And others being afraid to stir up old animosities, as the college was the child of the Cœtus party, and always opposed by the other party, sustained them in this timorous policy. Hence the convention in 1774, in urging on the measure for the professorate, kept the new college out of view. In like manner the convention, as such, that met in 1784, took no decided steps to organize the college. But letters having been received from Holland, in reply to their petition for a suitable professor, with strong recommendations from the classis, and from the faculty of Utrecht, in favour of Dr. Livingston, he was unanimously elected to the professorate, and entered immediately on the duties thereof.

In this distinguished convention, considerable progress was made in ecclesiastical organization. At the adoption of the articles of union in 1771, the convention of which Dr. Livingston was president, had before them the entire model of the government of the Church of Holland. Yet for some particular reasons, they simply denominated their conventions "the particular and the general assembly." But this convention of 1784, resolved to distinguish these assemblies by the names usually given to such judicatories. At first "the particular assembly," was called "a classis," and "the general assembly," a "particular synod."

At the commencement of the war of the revolution, there were about eighty churches in New York state: these were divided into three particular assemblies, or classes; in New Jersey there were forty churches: these were formed into two classes. These met twice in the year. The particular synod was a delegated body, consisting of two pastors and two elders, from each classis, and met once a year. And it was now also for the first time resolved to have a third assembly, to be called "the general synod." This court was held in 1792. It consisted, at first, of *all* the ministers of the church, with an elder from each congregation, and it met each third year. Some years afterwards, when the churches had multiplied greatly, it was made a delegated body, each classis nominating three bishops and three elders as their representatives; the nomination to be confirmed by each of two particular synods to which the classes belonged. And this court met, and still meets annually.*

* Dr. Gunn's Life of Dr. Livingston, p. 274.

In 1784, the trustees, with a laudable zeal, made an attempt to resuscitate the college, called Queen's College, at New Brunswick. It went into operation under the superintendence of the venerable Dr. Hardenberg, its first president, who was as eminent as a ripe scholar as a profound theologian. But for want of funds, caused by the general distress pervading this young nation, just come out of the war of the revolution; and also for want of an adequate faculty to co-operate with its distinguished president, and its able professor of the languages, Dr. Taylor; it gradually declined, and had at last to be suspended for a season.

In 1807, the efforts of these devoted and persevering friends of literature were more successful. The old building was an unsightly and inconvenient one for such an institution. They proceeded, with the greatest industry and perseverance, to collect funds for a suitable building. In 1809 they laid the foundation of the present beautiful edifice, on a commanding eminence, overlooking the city of New Brunswick. The original cost of this stately erection was thirty thousand dollars.

One thing was yet necessary to the success of the college, and that was attained in 1807. The trustees entered into a covenant with the general synod of the Dutch Church; uniting their mutual interests and funds, giving the college the whole influence and patronage of the church, and placing the theological professorate in connexion with the college; but yet, in such a manner, that the college is not made by any means, a sectarian institution. In conformity with this covenant, Dr. Livingston, the synod's theological professor, was elected professor in the college, and officiated as the active president; the governor of the state being then, *ex officio*, the nominal president. But in 1816, a suspension of the college exercises was caused by the exhaustion of its literary funds. This suspension continued unto 1825. Then was it revived with great spirit, and with a full faculty.* And it continues in successful operation to this day,—a bright star among the other bright stars in the constellation of literature in our happy republic! The theological seminary has three professorships richly endowed; and filled, at present, by three able divines. The college is under the care

* With unusual pleasure does the writer of this look back on that organization. To him the trustees were pleased to assign the chair of the languages. And he had such men as these as his colleagues: Professor Adrain, Prof. Woodhull, Prof. Dr. John Dewitt; and the venerable and beloved president Dr. Milledoler was at the head of the institution, including our college and the theological seminary. Adrain and Dewitt, followed Woodhull, to their rest in heaven. Two of us survive, but in different spheres of duty and service.

of the Hon. A. Bruyn Hasbrouck, LL. D., the president, a most distinguished scholar and learned civilian; assisted by a full complement of able professors and tutors.* Since its late organization, the college at New Brunswick, hitherto known as Queen's College, has been named Rutgers's College, after the name of its munificent patron, the late Col. Rutgers, who was a gallant revolutionary officer, and an eminent man of God, in the church.

Thus far has the Dutch Reformed Church struggled successfully through all her difficulties and distressing calamities. What a pleasing contrast there is between her present flourishing condition and that of 1769! Then, was she distracted and rent by two violent contending parties; and her courts and sanctuaries were the arena of unnatural and unchristian broils, and a hissing, and a by-word among the enemies of religion; while all good men deplored her impending fate! She was, moreover, without an academy, or a college of her own; and subjected to a dependence on a foreign nation for her supply of ministers. Now, "peace reigns within her walls; and prosperity within her palaces." For our God hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary, to hear the groanings of his people. He hath regarded the prayer of the destitute. The Lord hath builded up our Zion, and he hath appeared in his glory among her children! She has, now, her academy and schools; her college, and her theological seminary; blessed with accomplished, pious, and efficient teachers. She has her foreign and domestic missionary societies: her Sabbath School Union, and her Education Society; and her twelve scholarships, and her Van Benschooten endowment:† to bring forward the pious sons of the church into the holy ministry.

During the last forty years she has been steadily "lengthening her cords, and strengthening her stakes." Very many new churches have been planted by her Home Missionary Board; particularly in the northern and the western parts of the state of New York, and in the city of New York, where the first and venerable Collegiate Church, which once stood alone, now beholds two great classes, with their numerous and flourishing churches under their care, and prospering, by the grace of God, under an able, devoted, and pious ministry. She is now directing her earnest and successful labours, in planting Dutch Reformed churches in Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. At the same time she watches, with the deepest interest, the progress

* See the statistics appended to this.

† The Van Benschooten Fund was bequeathed by the pious and venerable Dominie Van Benschooten. It amounts to twenty thousand dollars, and it is designed to carry pious youth through a complete scientific course, as well as the theological studies.

of her foreign missionaries in the far East; and rejoices in their successful efforts in bringing the heathen tribes to the Lord Jesus Christ, and the hope of glory.

Our fathers brought this vine from Holland; and they planted it here, in the name of the Most High. They cultivated it with their hands, and watered it with their tears! Under the dew of heaven has she spread her fair and fruitful branches over the land. We sit under her shadow with great delight, and eat the pleasant fruits thereof! The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad. Blessed be the name of the Lord our God, for ever and ever! And let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen.

II. THE DOCTRINES OF THE DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH.

The doctrines of our church are those which, in common with all the branches of the Reformed Churches, we have received from the reformers. These blessed doctrines were taught the church by the prophets and apostles, by the command of our Lord, the only king and head of the church. They are contained in the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and in them alone. For, in concert with the church of God, in all ages, we reject traditions and expositions of the fathers, except only as they strictly and rigidly agree with the Holy Bible, the only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. These doctrines we hold as they were taught by Luther and Calvin, so far as they taught as Paul and the other inspired writers taught.

We receive as our creed the Confession of Faith, as revised in the national synod of the Council of Dort, in the years 1618 and 1619, consisting of thirty-seven articles; with the Heidelberg Catechism; the compend of the Christian religion; the canons of the Council of Dort, on the famous five points:—I. Predestination. II. Definite atonement of Christ. III. & IV. Man's entire corruption and helplessness, and his conversion by God's grace alone. V. Perseverance of the saints in grace.

These doctrines have been received as their creed by all the churches of God, whose honoured representatives were members of the Council of Dort, namely: 1. England and Scotland; 2. The Electoral Palatinate; 3. Hesse; 4. Switzerland; 5. The French Churches; 6. South Holland; 7. North Holland; 8. Zealand; 9. Province of Utrecht; 10. Friesland; 11. Groningen; 12. Omland; 13. Drent; 14. The Republic and Church of Bremen; 15. The Republic and Church of Emden; 16. Gelderland; 17. Zutphen; 18. Wetteraw; 19. The Republic

and Church of Geneva; 20. Transylvania; and 21. The German Reformed Church.

These doctrines, usually called Calvinistic, or rather the doctrines of the Reformed Church, are the same precisely as those expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with some few exceptions; such, for instance, as that in relation to church government, which is characterized by diocesan bishops. With us, and all other churches, each pastor who presides over a church, is strictly, according to the word of God, a Christian bishop. For, by the testimony of Paul, (Acts xx. 5, 17, and 28,) every presbyter or teaching elder, is a bishop.

We refer the reader for further particulars in reference to the Reformed Churches and our church, as one of them, to our Confession of Faith, catechism, and canons, in the book of our church. This, we repeat, is the canonical book also of the German Reformed Church, the French Church, and the Swiss Church. These are usually bound up with our psalms and hymns, and are in every body's hands who chooses to examine them.

In regard to our "liturgy," we have to state that it contains, as every one sees, prayers carefully adapted to persons in various circumstances, public and private. But these are designed, now, simply as models, not as regular forms. When the early reformers, by the grace of God, led "the church" out of the long captivity of modern Babylon, they found their people extremely ignorant. Hence they needed helps. They were children, and crippled in their walk. They needed crutches to lean on in their early helplessness. But now, we consider our ministers, elders, deacons, and members of our church, as no longer little and lisping children, and cripples needing crutches. These crutches we throw away, and we walk without them! This we do because the spirit of God is really given to all who ask of him help in prayer. But we have no desire to interfere with those of our reformed brethren who deem themselves, as yet, incapable of doing without these helps for the weak ones of the flock.

The only part of our liturgy which is enjoined to be read, is this: the Form of Baptism, in order to preserve the uniformity of vows: together with the short prayer, before the vows taken by the parents; and also the formula of the holy communion of the Lord's Supper. This the minister reads, while all the members, carefully and devoutly follow him, with the form open before them, in their seats. This is the amount, and the proper use of our liturgy.

III. ITS CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

Our form of government is that which has been adopted by all the churches of the Reformation in Holland, France, Switzerland, Germany, Scotland, with the exception of England,—which is governed by diocesan bishops,—and of the famous Puritans of Old and New England, whose form is that of independency. We refer to our form in our Book of the Church. Our primary court is that of *the consistory*, the same as that called *a session* in the Presbyterian Church. This consists of the three distinct offices: ministers or bishops, elders, and deacons. The deacons in our church have no right to preach. We adhere strictly to the scriptural institution of that office, as detailed in Acts vi. They have the care of the poor; and take charge of the alms and the proper distribution of them. Our church discountenances the office of trustees, especially of a board of trustees, whose members are not even required to be members of the church in full communion. The most general, I may say the universal, practice of ecclesiastical arrangement with us, is this: the pastors and elders meet as a spiritual court, to transact spiritual concerns, such as the admission of members, exercising discipline, &c. The deacons meet statedly, to make provision for the poor and make distributions. And the consistory, composed of the pastor, elders, and deacons, meets for the transaction of all temporal business relating to their own church. On important occasions, such as that of calling a minister, the grand consistory is called together. This is composed of all those individuals who have been at any time elders and deacons in the church.

The next court in our church is *the classis*, corresponding precisely to *the presbytery* in our sister churches. This is composed of a minister and an elder from each distinct church, under the care of the classis.

The next court is *the particular synod*. Of these we have two, namely, the Synod of New York and the Synod of Albany, or the Southern and Northern Synods. These consist of two ministers and two elders from each classis within its bounds.

The highest court, from which there is no appeal, is *the general synod*. This also is a representative body. It is composed of three ministers and three elders from each classis throughout the entire church. At its first organization, this court met triennially; now it meets annually, for the despatch of all business belonging to the church.

In one peculiar feature do we differ from our Presbyterian brethren in the United States and Scotland. In the different branches of these most eminently distinguished churches, their elders are chosen *for life*. With us they are chosen to serve for two years in succession. And if they do their duty they are again eligible, after having been out of their office one year. If they have not fulfilled their office to edification, they may be left off the ticket; and no offence is given or taken. This, we believe, has most essentially contributed to preserve the peace, and promote the edification of the church, and to stir up good men to increased faithfulness to God and the church.

IV. THE FORM OF WORSHIP.

This is nearly the same as that of all those who adopt the Presbyterian form of worship. With us, the ancient and time-honoured custom and mode is this: the minister and people, who are members, upon entering the church, bow down, and in secret worship the King of Zion. In the morning, the pastor begins the solemnity of the day by reading the ten commandments; and in the other services of the day, by reading a chapter of the holy scriptures. The assembly then sing; then there is the solemn benediction; then a brief address, called the *exordium remotum*, containing an outline of the subject to be discussed;* then prayer; then singing; then the sermon; then a prayer; then a collection of alms for the poor; then singing, and the benediction.

Our psalmody is that which has been carefully prepared by a committee of our General Synod. It consists of the psalms of Watts, greatly improved and enlarged, and two books of hymns. It is a rule of our church that each pastor shall lecture on a section of our Heidelberg Catechism, in the afternoon of the sabbath, so as to go through the whole in a definite time. These lectures exhibit an entire system of pure and holy doctrine to the people, in a regular course. And to this admirable system do we humbly and prayerfully ascribe the uniformity and strictness of adherence to pure doctrine in our churches. The design is to secure doctrinal preaching, and that of the entire system, to our people, in a regular course, from year to year.

* This has, by a late regulation, been left discretionary, and by many it is dispensed with.

V. THE STATISTICS.

The annual report for 1843 presents this summary of the church: There are twenty classes; two particular synods, that of New York, and that of Albany, under one general synod, the highest court of appeal, which meets annually. There are two hundred and sixty-seven churches, and two hundred and fifty-nine ministers, and twenty three theological students, at present.

The number of families, as reported, is 21,569; the ascertained number of individuals in the congregations, 96,302: total in communion, 29,322. The increase of members on confession of their faith, from June, 1842, to June, 1843, 3202, by certificate, 1021: total increase in the year, 4223. Baptized in the year: infants, 2211, adults, 682. Number of catechumens, 5664; number in biblical instruction, 3988; the number of sabbath schools, 269; the number of pupils in these, 15,534.

Our college and theological seminary are located at New Brunswick, N. J. These institutions have been richly endowed by the liberality of our church. The two institutions are so far connected that the theological professors render certain important services in the college. The venerable Dr. Milledoler lately retired from these institutions, after having rendered for a series of years most valuable services, as professor of didactic and polemic theology, and as president of the college, which last laborious office he performed gratuitously, with the utmost fidelity and great success, for nearly sixteen years. Since that, the Hon. A. Bruyn Hasbrouck, a gentleman of distinguished taste and scholarship, has been elected president. The college is now in very successful operation, under his care, and that of an able and learned faculty.

In the theological school, there are three professorships, occupied by distinguished men, who instruct the youth for the ministry in every branch of a complete theological course. At the close of the theological year, there is a public theological commencement, at which the graduating class pronounce, from memory, suitable discourses. This will have a very happy tendency to encourage our youth to study, more than heretofore, true pulpit eloquence, and tend to bring back the good old custom of pronouncing, instead of reading, discourses.*

* By "pronouncing discourses," we do not mean "extemporaneous preaching." We mean the writing fully out of discourses, and delivering them from memory and *judgment*. To preach "extempore," and without laborious preparation, is one of the worst habits, into which any preacher or minister can fall.

To the seminary are attached twelve scholarships, for the aid of eminently gifted youth, whose hard lot has been to struggle with adversity. The Van Benschooten Fund of \$20,000 produces a considerable annual revenue. By the will of the pious donor, the proceeds are applied to carry youth through the college course, as well as the theological course.

For farther particulars, I refer the reader to the following: The Outline of the History of the Dutch Reformed Church, by the late Dr. Romeyn, in the pages of the Christian's Magazine, vol. i.; to the extended Outline of the History of the Dutch Reformed Church, in the pages of the Magazine of the Dutch Church, vol. ii.; Dr. Gunn's Life of Dr. Livingston; The History of New York, by Judge Smith; Dr. Janeway's Abstract of the History of Rutgers's College; The Minutes of the Particular and General Synods of the Dutch Reformed Church; The Appendix to Dr. Bradford's Sermon of 1813, containing the Address of the Committee of the General Synod of 1807; The Encyclopædia of Christian Knowledge, article Dutch Reformed Church; Watson's Olden Times; Olden Times in New York; Benedict's History of all Religions; The American Quarterly Register, for May, 1833, and February, 1834; and, finally, Dr. Dewitt's History of the Dutch Reformed Church, which he is now (1843) preparing by the request of our General Synod.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST.

BY THE REV. R. RICHARDSON,
OF VIRGINIA.

THEIR RISE, PROGRESS, FAITH, AND PRACTICE.

THE religious society, whose members prefer to be known by the primitive and unsectarian appellation of "Disciples of Christ," or by that of "Christians," the title first given to the followers of our Lord at Antioch, A. D. 41, but who are variously designated in different sections, as "Baptists," "Reformed Baptists," "Reformers," or "Campbellites," had its origin in an effort made, a few years since, to effect a union of the pious of all parties, by the ties of a common Christianity.

Thomas Campbell, who had been long a minister of high standing in the "secession" branch of the Presbyterian Church, in the north of Ireland, his native country, and who had been at all times characterized by his love for the Bible, and for godly men of all parties, without respect to sectarian differences, having visited the United States, as well for the recovery of his health, which had become much impaired, as with a view to a permanent location, was, after a lapse of nearly three years, followed by his family, under the charge of his eldest son Alexander, then a young man, and took up his abode in Washington county, Pennsylvania, where his time had been chiefly spent, since the period of his arrival, in supplying with ministerial labour the destitute congregations of the seceder connexion.

Continually deploring, however, the divided and distracted condition of the religious community at large, and deeply convinced that its divisions were unnecessary, unscriptural, and most injurious to the interests of religion and of society: he at length formed the resolution to make a public effort for the restoration of the original unity of the church. Being joined in this resolution by his son Alexander, whose

views of religion had been much liberalized and extended by an intimacy with Greville Ewing and the Independents of Glasgow, in Scotland, during his studies, which he had just completed at the university in that city; and whose talents, learning, and energy have, since this period, so widely disseminated the principles of union then adopted: an attempt was made, in the first instance, to obtain the co-operation of the people and ministers with whom he stood associated.

The great fundamental point urged at this juncture was, that in order to Christian union, and the full influence of the gospel, it was absolutely necessary that the Bible alone should be taken as the authorized bond of union, and the infallible rule of faith and practice; in other words, that the revelations of God should be made to displace from their position all human creeds, confessions of faith, and formularies of doctrine and church government, as being not only unnecessary, but really a means of perpetuating division. Containing, indeed, much truth, and embracing, for the most part, the great leading facts and doctrines of Christianity, each one, it was argued, superadded unfortunately its own peculiar theory of religion, and blended with the Christianity common to all, speculative opinions respecting matters not revealed, which, nevertheless, were, in these theological systems, exalted to an equal authority with the undoubted facts of the gospel. These conflicting opinions, uncertain for want of clear scriptural evidence, were, whether true or false, unimportant in themselves, as contrasted with the great and plainly revealed truths of Holy Writ; and, as derived from human reason, and being the offspring of human weakness, were regarded as constituting essentially human religions, and as being therefore wholly devoid of any regenerating or saving efficacy. It was conceived to have been a small matter that the Lutheran Reformation should have freed the church from the religion of the priest, if she persisted in substituting for it the religion of men, rather than the religion of God, as God himself had given it. For, while it was admitted that the various formularies of religion contained the great and leading points of Christianity, and the pleasing reflection could be indulged that almost all parties were agreed in those, as, for instance, briefly summed up in the Nicene, or Apostles' Creed: it was urged, that the various systems of human opinions, commingled with these truths, had so diluted, weakened, and even perverted them, as to have deprived them in a great measure of their power in the salvation of the world; so that the gospel, in the hands of Protestantism, had become a vague, contradictory, incomprehensible religion, quite unable to effect the conversion of the world, or accomplish the grand, extensive, and blessed results, for the attainment of which,

the religion of Christ, in its concentrated purity, was so admirably fitted. It was therefore proposed, that all human creeds, as being incomplete if they contained any thing less than the Bible—unworthy of credit, if they contained any thing more upon the subject of religion, and in either case, as highly injurious for the reasons above given, should be indiscriminately repudiated by the churches, and that the Bible itself, and more especially the New Testament, as containing the clear developement of the religion of Christ, should be, as was undeniably the case in primitive ages, the creed, the confession, and the guide of all.

The plea that human creeds and discipline were necessary to preserve purity of doctrine and government in the church, was totally rejected, as disproved by the well known fact that they had failed to do this, and also as an imputation upon the divine goodness and wisdom, implying that God was unwilling to give a sufficient revelation, and left something for men to supply; or that men could express the truths revealed, in better words, and in expressions less liable to misconstruction, than those selected by the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, it was insisted, that the Scriptures, interpreted in conformity with the fixed laws of language, could convey but the same ideas to all unbiassed minds respecting every thing necessary to salvation; and that if, perchance, difference of sentiment should arise, respecting minor and incidental matters, these inferences or opinions were to be distinguished from faith, and were neither to be made a term of communion, nor imposed by one Christian upon another. Or, to express the whole in the language employed by Thos. Campbell, "Nothing was to be received as a matter of faith or duty, for which there could not be produced a *Thus saith the Lord*, either in express terms, or by approved scripture precedent."

This overture for a religious reformation being rejected by the seceders as a body, but embraced by some members: an application was made to the pious of all the parties in the vicinity, and a "declaration and address" drawn up and printed, in which all were invited to form a union upon the principles above stated. A considerable number of individuals responded to this appeal, and a congregation was immediately organized upon Brush Run, in Washington county, on the 7th of September, 1810,* where a house of worship was erected, and where ministerial duties were performed conjointly by T. Campbell and his son Alexander, who had been duly ordained pastors of the church.

* See Supplement to this article.

It is proper to remark here, that the members of this congregation were not associated together in a loose and informal manner, at its formation. On the contrary, it was deemed absolutely necessary that every one, in being admitted, should give some proof that he understood the nature of the relation he assumed, and the true scriptural ground of salvation. Each applicant, therefore, was required to give a satisfactory answer to the question: "What is the meritorious cause of the sinner's acceptance with God?" Upon expressing an entire reliance upon the merits of Christ alone for justification, and evincing a conduct becoming the Christian profession, he was received into fellowship.* Such was the humble origin of a reformation, now widely extended, which did not, as is often the case, proceed from the fire of enthusiasm, but was the offspring of calm and long continued deliberation, frequent consultation, and patient, laborious, and prayerful investigation of the Holy Scriptures; and which had never for its object to add a new sect to those already existing, but was designed, from its very inception, to put an end to all partisan controversies, and, far from narrowing the basis of Christian fellowship, to furnish abundant room for all believers upon the broad ground of the Bible, and a common reliance upon the merits of Christ.

Much devotion and interest was manifested by the church of Brush Run, and the utmost peace and harmony prevailed amongst its members for a number of months. Most of them being poor, they were unable to finish the interior of the frame meeting house which they had erected, and were accordingly wont to assemble in it, without fire, during the inclemency even of winter. They were also in the habit of visiting often at each other's houses, and spending whole nights in social prayer; searching the scriptures, asking and answering questions, and singing hymns. Their affections seemed to be elevated above the love of party, by the love of Christ; and the deeply implanted prejudice of a sectarian education and training appeared to have died away beneath the overshadowing influence of divine truth.

A circumstance occurred, however, after some time, which showed that these prejudices had power to revive; and that, like noxious weeds, they were more hardy and enduring than the things that are salutary to men. This circumstance was the presentation, by a member, of the subject of infant baptism, which at once necessarily brought up the question so often debated between Baptists and Pedo-

* For want of these proofs, two persons were rejected at the first meeting.

baptists: whether or not this ordinance could be scripturally administered to infants? Mr. Campbell, sen., entered upon the discussion of the subject, with his impressions in favour of the affirmative; but he examined the question with so much impartiality in a series of discourses, that a number of his hearers became convinced thereby, on the contrary, that the practice of infant baptism could not be sustained by adequate scripture evidence; and the mind of his son Alexander especially, was, after a full examination of the subject, led to the conclusion, not only that the baptism of infants was without scriptural authority, but that immersion in water, upon a true profession of faith in Christ, alone constituted Christian baptism. Upon stating to his oldest sister, his conclusions, and his intention to comply with what he conceived to be the requisitions of the gospel, she informed him that her convictions and intentions had for some time been the same; and, upon stating the matter to their father, he proposed that they should send for a Baptist preacher, and attend upon the ministration of the ordinance in the immediate region of their labours. Before the appointed time, Thomas Campbell himself, together with several other members of the Brush Run congregation, became so forcibly impressed with the same convictions, that they were prepared to accompany them, and all were immersed, upon the simple profession of faith made by the Ethiopian eunuch, (Acts viii. 37,) by Elder Luse of the Baptist community, on the 12th June, 1812.

This was an important occurrence in the history of this little band of reformers; for it not only revived the educational prejudices of all those who were unfavourable to immersion, or attached to infant baptism, and induced them immediately to withdraw themselves from the church; but it was the means of bringing the remainder, who now constituted a congregation of immersed believers, into immediate connexion with the Baptists. For, although disinclined to a combination with any religious party, known as such, they deemed the principles of the Baptists favourable to reformation and religious freedom, and believed that as they had it in their power to preserve their own independence as a church, and the integrity of the principles of their first organization, a connexion with the Baptists would afford them a more extended field of usefulness. Accordingly, in the fall of 1813, they were received into the Redstone Baptist Association, carefully and expressly stipulating at the same time, in writing, that "No terms of union or communion other than the holy scriptures should be required."

The novelty of those simple views of Christianity which Alexander Campbell, as messenger of the church of Brush Run, urged with

much ability upon the association, began immediately to excite considerable stir in that body, with whom an opposition to human creeds and to claims of jurisdiction over the churches, found but little favour. With the more liberal-minded Baptists, however, Mr. Campbell's views gradually prevailed; and so high became the confidence of the Baptist community, in general, in his talents and knowledge of the scriptures, that he was selected, after some time, to debate the question of Christian baptism with Mr. J. Walker, a minister of the secession church. This debate, held at Mount Pleasant, Ohio, in June, 1820, being afterwards published, greatly contributed to extend Mr. Campbell's celebrity, as well as to diffuse abroad among the Baptists his views of the Christian institution. The same result followed a second debate upon the same subject, which grew out of the first one, and which he held, in 1823, at Washington, in the State of Kentucky, with Mr. McCalla of the Presbyterian church, so that the views of Mr. Campbell became generally diffused among the Baptist churches of the western country. Meanwhile, a jealousy on the part of some leading members of the Redstone Association, of his increasing popularity and commanding talents, led them to inveigh against his principles as innovating and disorganizing; and finally created so much dissension in that body, and so much animosity towards the church of Brush Run, that the latter, in order to avoid its effects, dismissed about thirty members, including Alexander Campbell, to Wellsburg, Virginia, where they were constituted as a new church, and, upon application, were admitted into the Mahoning Association of Ohio, with some of whose members they had already formed a favourable intimacy. This body proved much more liberal in its views; and after the bickerings and dissensions of nearly ten years at Redstone, the reformers were pleased to find in it not only liberality of feeling, but a disposition to follow implicitly the dictates of the scriptures. Various meetings of preachers were held to consider and investigate the ancient and apostolic order of things; and at length nearly the whole association came by degrees into the views presented; so that, in the year 1828, it rejected finally all human formularies of religion, and relinquished all claim to jurisdiction over the churches; resolving itself into a simple annual meeting for the purpose of receiving reports of the progress of the churches; for worship, and mutual co-operation in the spread of the gospel.

The influence of so large a number of churches, embracing a considerable portion of the Western Reserve, with several able preachers, necessarily gave great extension to the principles advo-

cated by Mr. Campbell. It was but a short time, however, until the abandonment of usages long cherished by the Baptists, and the introduction of views and practices not commonly received by them, gave rise to so much umbrage and opposition on the part of the adjoining churches, composing the Beaver Association: that this body were induced, being not a little influenced also by the persevering hostility of that of Redstone, to denounce as heretical, and exclude from their fellowship, all those churches which favoured the views of the reformers. The schism, thus produced, was soon extended to Kentucky, to eastern Virginia, and in short to all those Baptist churches and associations into which the views of Mr. Campbell had been introduced by his debates and writings; the Baptists, in all cases, separating from their communion all who favoured the sentiments of the Disciples, being unwilling to concede even permission to believe the plain dictates of the scriptures to those who freely granted to them, without a breach of fellowship, unrestricted liberty of opinion.

The Disciples, thus suddenly cut off from their connexion with the Baptists, formed themselves every where into distinct churches, independent of each other's control, but holding the same sentiments, having the same fellowship, and continuing to carry out the great principles originally professed, exhorting all men to return to the Bible alone, as the only rule of faith, and, in the language of Thomas Campbell, to co-operate together for "the restoration of pure primitive apostolic Christianity, in letter and spirit; in principle and practice."

The proscriptive measures of the Baptist clergy, and the persecuting spirit by which they had been often guided, proved, as has ever been the case, favourable to the cause they laboured to overthrow. No sooner had a separation been effected, than prejudices began to subside, and misapprehensions to be corrected, as the excited feelings which produced them gradually died away. Many intelligent Baptists came over, from time to time, to the ranks of the Disciples, and many others were admitted to fellowship with the latter, without being excluded from communion with their Baptist brethren. Indeed, many of the Baptist clergy, as the objects of the Disciples became better understood, came to approve them; and even to a certain extent to adopt their sentiments. So great has been the approximation, that the most friendly feelings now almost every where exist between the Disciples and the Baptists; and those very points, as, for instance, the rejection of creeds, and baptism for

remission of sins, which were at first regarded as most objectionable, are at length adopted and publicly maintained by certain of the most talented Baptist ministers and editors in the Union.

Meanwhile the Disciples have rapidly increased in number, not by these accessions from the Baptists so much as by a general diffusion of their principles amongst all parties, and especially by an almost unprecedented success in the conversion of those who had not as yet embraced any of the religious systems of the day. Many have come over from the Presbyterians; some from the Episcopalians and from the Lutherans; among the latter, two well-educated ministers; but more, both of preachers and people, from the Methodists. A few Universalists have united with them, renouncing their own distinguishing tenets; some Roman Catholics also; some Tunkers; English and Scotch Baptists, and Independents. Indeed, some from almost every party have renounced their conflicting opinions, and adopted the faith and doctrine of the primitive church. It is also to be noted, that a great many sceptics and infidels have been converted through the labours of Mr. A. Campbell, and especially by his able defence of Christianity against Mr. Owen, in a public debate held in the city of Cincinnati, in the year 1829, which was published and extensively circulated in this country, and republished in England. Many of the writings of Mr. Campbell and his fellow-labourers have been republished in England, where the Disciples are becoming numerous. Their churches are found also in Wales and in Ireland. In the United States they are most numerous in Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Virginia. There are a few churches in the British provinces. The whole number of communicants in the United States, so far as has been ascertained, is believed to fall but a little short of 200,000.

It will not be necessary to say much of the faith or practice of this society, after the above history of its origin and progress. From this it will appear evident that it is founded upon the two great distinguishing principles of the Lutheran Reformation, to wit: "the taking of the Bible alone as the rule of faith, to the entire exclusion of tradition; and the relying only upon that justification that is obtained through faith in Jesus Christ." Through all the various phases imposed upon this new effort at reformation, by its relative position to different points of Christian doctrine, or to sectarian parties, its real position has never changed: it has preserved its identity, and reflected more or less upon the whole community the light of divine truth. The controversies which have attended its progress, have been neither few nor unimportant; but their object has ever been the exhibition

and defence of truth; and, though it were too much to say that imperfect views, and inconsiderate expressions have not, at times, proceeded from even the most prudent of its advocates, giving rise to various misconceptions and misrepresentations on the part of its opposers: it may safely be asserted, that there has been, from the beginning, an unwavering devotion to the cause of primitive Christianity, of Christian union, and of an entire conformity of the church to the requirements of the sacred volume.

One circumstance peculiar to the society deserves notice here. It is this: that its knowledge of the Christian institution, and its conformity to its requirements have been progressive. Unlike the various sects which are founded upon human creeds and confessions, and which are, by virtue of their very constitution, forbidden ever to get beyond the imperfect knowledge, or to differ from the ignorance of the men who composed their formularies: this society cast itself, without fear, upon the broad and free expanse of divine revelation itself; unrestricted by the narrow boundaries of parties or sects, and undaunted by human animadversion, to seek the pearls and treasures of divine truth. Thrown thus upon the scriptures alone for religious instruction, by the fundamental principle of their association, it would say but little, indeed, for the perspicuity, depth, and perfection of the Bible, if, during the protracted investigations and discussions, carried on by members of acknowledged learning and talent, there had been nothing more learned of the Christian institution, than was known and realized at first. The truth is, that the different characteristic points of primitive Christianity were developed in succession. The object, however, has been one from the beginning—to disinter the edifice of ancient Christianity from the rubbish which so many ages had accumulated upon it; and the beauty of those portions which were first exposed, only induced greater exertion to bring others into view. It was the *unity* of the church which first struck the attention: the subsequent submission to immersion is only one example, among others, of that progression which consistency with their own principles required. Thus, it was not until about ten years after this, that the *definite object of immersion* was fully understood, when it was recognised as the *remitting ordinance* of the gospel, or the appointed means through which the penitent sinner obtained an assurance of that pardon, or remission of sins, procured for him by the sufferings and death of Christ. Nor was it until a still later period, that this doctrine was *practically applied*, in calling upon believing penitents to be baptized for the purpose specified. This view of baptism gave great impor-

tance to the institution, and has become one of the prominent features of this reformation.

The practice of *weekly communion* is another characteristic. This was adopted at the very beginning, as the well-known and universally admitted custom of the apostolic age. Their views of the nature and design of this ordinance, differ not from those of Protestants in general. They are not in favour of "close communion," as it is termed, nor do they prohibit any pious persons who feel disposed to unite with them in the commemoration of the Lord's death. Their manner of dispensing the ordinance is simple and impressive, conformable to the example of Christ, and the injunctions of Paul. (1 Cor. xi.)

They are accustomed to set apart the first day of the week, not as a Jewish or a Christian *sabbath*, but as commemorative of the resurrection of Christ, and to be devoted to scripture-reading, meditation, prayer, and the ordinances of public worship. These are prayer and praise; teaching and exhortation; the Lord's Supper, and the fellowship or contribution for the poor, in accordance with Acts xi. 42.

As to *government*, each congregation is independent of every other, managing its own affairs, and electing its own officers. Of the latter, three classes are recognised: elders or bishops, deacons, and evangelists. The functions of elders and deacons are restricted to each individual church and its vicinity. The evangelists are usually itinerant, except in cities and towns, and are supported by the voluntary contributions of their brethren. A co-operation of the churches, for the spread of the gospel, is regarded as scriptural, and is now urged as highly necessary to a more effective system of evangelical labour.

In the *proclamation of the gospel* to sinners, their practice is of course regulated by their views of the state of man, and the nature of the Christian institution. They regard the unconverted as in a state of separation and alienation from God, dead in trespasses and sins; and look upon the gospel as the power of God to the salvation of every one who believes it. They conceive that this Word of God, is that incorruptible seed of which the children of God are born; God having, according to his own will, begotten them "by the word of truth, that they might be a kind of first fruits of his creatures!" They believe that the word is thus the means employed by the Holy Spirit, in the conversion of men; and that the divine testimony itself is the source of that faith by which the gospel is received to the saving of the soul, for, in the language of scripture, that "faith comes by hearing; and hearing, by the word of God." They regard the kingdom

of Christ as a spiritual one, first formally and publicly set up on the day of Pentecost (Acts. ii.), upon the exaltation and coronation of Christ, as evinced, upon that occasion, by the descent of the Holy Spirit. They believe, that the apostle Peter, to whom Christ had committed the *keys* of the kingdom, did, on that day, give admission to the believing and penitent Jews, in exact conformity with the nature and requisitions of the gospel, and that *all* should be admitted *now*, upon the same principles, and in the same manner. That is to say, that upon a sincere belief of the testimony borne by prophets and apostles, respecting the birth, the life, the character, the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, accompanied by a true repentance, the sinner is to be immersed for the remission of sins, and the reception of the Holy Spirit, and is then to be added to the church, to walk in the commandments of the Lord, and manifest the graces of Christian character. If then they have any theory of conversion, it is simply that of the natural order of cause and effect; the Holy Spirit, through the divine testimony, being conceived to produce the faith of the gospel; this faith leading to repentance, to reformation, and consequent obedience to the commands of the gospel; and this obedience securing the immediate enjoyment of its promised blessings, the pardon of sins, and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The possession of the Holy Spirit is regarded as the evidence of sonship to God, and as the earnest of the spiritual and glorious inheritance promised to the righteous.

As a means of sanctification and growth in knowledge, the diligent study of the holy scriptures is every where earnestly enjoined. It may be safely affirmed, that no denomination in our country is so familiar with the contents of the Bible, although there is yet, doubtless, great deficiency in this respect with many. But, it is believed, that in this there is a progressive improvement, and a more special attention paid to the instruction of the young in the sacred volume, in families and Sunday schools.

With regard to the Divine Being, and the manifestations of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, by which he is revealed, the Disciples hold no sentiments incongruous with those of the parties who call themselves "evangelical." It is true, that their peculiar position has subjected them to much misrepresentation upon this subject, as well as upon others. For, because they felt it their duty to confine themselves to the *very language of scripture*, in relation to every subject of which it treats, they have been unwilling to use those scholastic terms and phrases, which the wisdom of men has substituted in its room; and this, not only on account of the principle involved, but from a

fear of introducing, along with unscriptural expressions, unscriptural ideas. Nevertheless, although they use not the words Trinity, Triune, &c., they receive every thing which the scripture affirms of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, giving to every expression its full and obvious meaning. They hold that the Word which was in the beginning with God, and which was God, and by whom all things were made, became flesh and dwelt among men, manifesting his glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; and that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. And with respect to the Holy Spirit, they believe that he is the "Spirit of God," the "Comforter," the "Spirit of Christ," who spoke by prophets and apostles, filling them with divine wisdom and power; and that he is "the gift of God," "to those who ask him," who are made "the habitation of God through the Spirit," by whose presence they are rendered "temples of the living God," and "sanctified," "renewed," and "saved."

As it respects practical Christianity, the Disciples enjoin an entire conformity to the divine will, in heart as well as life. The fruit of the Spirit they believe to consist "in all goodness, righteousness and truth." They think that the standard of piety and morality cannot be elevated too highly, and that the personal holiness of the professed followers of Christ, is the great object to be accomplished by the institutions of the gospel. They regard these as a means of salvation, *only* as they prove to be a means of renovation; knowing that "nothing avails in Christ Jesus but a new creature," and that "without holiness no one shall see the Lord." They are the more careful, therefore, to maintain the ancient simplicity and purity of these institutions, which are thus divinely adapted to the accomplishment of an object so greatly to be desired.

Nor do the Disciples neglect the claims of society at large, as it respects its general improvement, and the amelioration of its condition, by the benevolent associations through which the Bible has been circulated abroad, and temperance and morality promoted with a success so signal as clearly to display the finger of God. They strongly advocate the universal education of the people, as the best means of promoting human happiness, and of preparing the way for the universal spread of the gospel, and the introduction of that happy era, for which they, in common with other Christians, look, when the "tabernacle of God" shall be "with men;" when he "shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." They have already under their charge many seminaries of learning, and, among these, two colleges. One

of these, Bacon College, at Harrodsburg, Kentucky, is respectably endowed, furnished with a handsome college edifice, and in a very flourishing condition. The other, Bethany College, Virginia, is near the residence of Alexander Campbell, who is president of the institution. Its plan and its buildings are extensive, being designed for the education of the whole man, physical, intellectual, and moral. Its success has been very great, and although it has only commenced its third session, it already ranks in number of students, and in character, with the oldest institutions in the country.

Such being the faith and practice of the Disciples of Christ, their rapid increase in number may be attributed to the fact, that they have kept steadily before the community the claims of that common Christianity in which most parties are agreed. This agreement includes every prominent feature of the Reformation, without an exception. However parties may differ about their creeds, all agree with the Disciples in receiving the Bible. However various the views of different sects in scholastic theology, all pretty much agree with the Disciples in justification by faith, and in the necessity of repentance and reformation of life. However the former may contend with each other about sprinkling and pouring, as modes of baptism; all agree with the Disciples, and with each other, that immersion, at least, is undisputed baptism, and the only mode in which there is universal agreement. Nay, even in regard to the object of this institution, the different confessions of faith are almost entirely agreed, stating, in their respective articles upon baptism, that it is, to adopt the words of the Westminster Confession, "The sign and seal of regeneration; of remission of sins, and of giving up to God to walk in newness of life." The same sentimental agreement may be predicated of weekly communion; the observance of the Lord's day, &c., and most happily of the great design of the observance of religion, the promotion of holiness and righteousness of life. Thus, having for their object to unite all Christians together in the common faith, without regard to difference of opinion; and in the full enjoyment of the common salvation, without respect to sectarian distinctions: the Disciples labour in joyful hope to aid in bringing about that happy period when all shall be united "by the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace, in one body and one spirit; in one hope of their calling; one Lord; one faith; one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all."

SUPPLEMENT.

CHRISTIANITY is a system of religion and morality instituted by Jesus Christ, primarily taught by his apostles, and recorded in the New Testament. It has for its immediate object the amelioration of the character and condition of man, morally and religiously considered, as far as possible in this life, and ultimately his complete salvation from the guilt, the love, the practice, and punishment of sin. It consists in the knowledge, belief, and obedience of the testimony and law of Jesus Christ, as taught by his apostles, and recorded in the New Testament. It has many professional opposites, many rivals to contend with, all of which, however, may be reduced to three classes, viz: infidels, heretics, and schismatics. The first of these reject, the second subvert, and the third corrupt Christianity, and, of course, measurably destroy its benign and blissful effects.

In order to defend the Christian institution against the rival influence of these opponents, we must meet each of them respectively with the proper arguments. The infidels of every class, having no counter testimony to exhibit against the divine authority and authenticity of our sacred records, nor any thing comparable as a substitute to present to our reception, stand convicted of the most unreasonable obstinacy in rejecting a revelation, not only confirmed by every kind of accompanying evidence which the nature of the thing could justly require, but which also goes to confer upon the believing and obedient the greatest possible happiness, intellectual and moral, of which they are capable in existing circumstances, and of which our nature can be made capable in a blissful immortality.

But as it is from the perversions and corruptions of Christianity, and not from professed infidelity, that the proposed reformation is intended, we would most respectfully submit the following queries to the consideration of all concerned, for the purpose of bringing the subject fairly before them.

Queries.—1. Is not the Church of Christ upon earth essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one; consisting of all those, in every place, that profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him in all things according to the scriptures, and that manifest the same by their tempers and conduct, and of none else, as none else can be truly and properly called Christians?

2. Should not all that are enabled through grace, to make such a

profession, and to manifest the reality of it in their tempers and conduct, consider each other as the precious saints of God, love each other as brethren, children of the same family and father, temples of the same spirit, members of the same body, subjects of the same grace, objects of the same divine love, bought with the same price, and joint heirs of the same inheritance? Whom God hath thus joined together no man should dare to put asunder.

3. Is not division among Christians a pernicious evil?—Anti-christian, as it destroys the visible unity of the body of Christ, as if he were divided against himself, excluding and excommunicating a part of himself?—anti-scriptural, as being strictly prohibited by his sovereign authority—a direct violation of his express command?—anti-natural, as it excites Christians to contempt, to hate and oppose one another, who are bound by the highest and most endearing obligations to love each other as brethren, even as Christ has loved them? In a word, is it not productive of confusion, and of every evil work?

4. Is not the Christian community in a sectarian condition, existing in separate communities alienated from each other?

5. Is not such a condition the native and necessary result of corruption; that is, of the introduction of human opinions into the constitution, faith or worship of Christian societies?

6. Is it not the common duty and interest of all concerned, especially of the teachers, to put an end to this destructive anti-scriptural condition?

7. Can this be accomplished by continuing to proceed as hitherto; that is, by maintaining and defending each his favourite system of opinion and practice?

8. If not, how is it to be attempted and accomplished, but by returning to the original standard and platform of Christianity, expressly exhibited on the sacred page of the New Testament scripture?

9. Would not a strict and faithful adherence to this, by preaching and teaching precisely what the apostles taught and preached, for the faith and obedience of the primitive disciples, be absolutely, and to all intents and purposes, sufficient for producing all the benign and blissful intentions of the Christian institution?

10. Do not all these intentions terminate in producing the faith and obedience that justify and sanctify the believing and obedient subject?

11. Is not every thing necessary for the justification and sanctification of the believing and obedient, expressly taught and enjoined by the apostles in the execution of their commission for the conver-

sion and salvation of the nations; and fully recorded in the New Testament?

12. If so, what more is necessary, but that we expressly teach, believe and obey, what we find expressly recorded for these purposes? And would not our so doing, happily terminate our unhappy, scandalous, and destructive divisions?

The two following queries are subjoined for the sake of a clear definition of the leading and comprehensive terms, viz., *faith* and *obedience*—which comprehend the whole of the Christian religion.

13. Are not law and obedience, testimony and faith, relative terms, so that neither of the latter can exist without the former? that is, where there is no law, there can be no obedience; where there is no testimony, there can be no faith.

14. Again, is not testimony necessarily confined to facts, and law to authority, so that without the latter the former cannot be? that is, where there are no facts, there can be no testimony—where no authority, no law. Wherefore, in every case, faith must necessarily consist in belief of facts; and obedience, in a practical compliance with the expressed will or dictates of authority. By facts is here meant some things said or done.

Conclusion.—Upon the whole, these things being so, it necessarily follows, that Christianity, being a divine institution, there can be nothing human in it; consequently it has nothing to do with the doctrines and commandments of men; but simply and solely with the belief and obedience of the expressly recorded testimony and will of God, contained in the holy scriptures, and enjoined by the authority of the Saviour and his holy apostles upon the Christian community.

Reflections.—The affirmative of each of the above propositions being, as we presume, evidently true, they most certainly demand the prompt and immediate attention of all the serious professors of Christianity, of every name. The awful denunciations and providential indications of the divine displeasure against the present anti-christian state of Christendom, loudly call for reformation;—the personal and social happiness of all concerned, and the conversion of the unbelieving part of mankind equally demand it. Nevertheless, we are not authorized to expect, that any party, as such, will be induced by the above considerations, or by any other that can possibly be suggested, spontaneously and heartily to engage in the work of self-reformation. The sincere and upright in heart, however, ought not to be discouraged at the inattention and obstinacy of their brethren; for had this been the case in times past, no reformation had ever been effected. It becomes therefore the immediate duty

and privilege of all that perceive and feel the necessity of the proposed reformation, to exert themselves by every scriptural means to promote it. Seeing the pernicious nature and anti-scriptural effects of the present corruptions of Christianity, both upon professors, and non-professors, in producing alienations amongst the former, in direct opposition to the law of Christ, and in casting almost insuperable obstacles in the way of the conversion of the latter: the serious and upright of all parties must feel conscientiously bound to endeavour, to the utmost of their power, to effect a genuine and radical reformation; which, we presume, can only be effected by a sincere conformity to the original exhibition of our holy religion, the divinely authorized rule and standard of faith and practice. To such, therefore, we appeal; and for the consideration of such alone, we have respectfully submitted the above queries.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that *ye all* speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” (Paul, 1 Cor. i. 10.)

“Jesus lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, I pray for them who shall believe on me through the word of my apostles, that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me: that the world may know that thou hast sent me; and hast loved them as thou hast loved me.” (John xvii.)

“In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” (Matt. xv.)

“From the days of your fathers ye are gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them. Return to me, and I will return to you, saith the Lord of hosts.” (Mal. iii. 7.)

“Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.” (Rev. xviii. 4.)

“He that testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly; Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus.”

As a striking instance of the necessity and importance of the proposed reformation, we present the following extract from the Boston Anthology, which, with too many of the same kind that might be adduced, furnishes a mournful comment upon the text—we mean upon the sorrowful subject of our woful divisions and corruptions. The following reply to the Rev. Mr. Cram, missionary from Massachusetts to the Senecas, was made by the principal chiefs and warriors of the Six Nations, in council assembled at Buffalo Creek, state of New York, in the presence of the agent of the United States for In-

dian Affairs, in the summer of 1805: "I am come, brethren," said the missionary, "to enlighten your minds, and to instruct you how to worship the Great Spirit agreeably to his will, and to preach to you the gospel of his Son, Jesus Christ. There is but one way to serve God, and if you do not embrace the right way, you cannot be happy hereafter." To which they replied, "Brother, we understand your religion is written in a book. You say that there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit. If there be but one religion, why do you white people differ so much about it? Why not all agree, as you can all read the book? Brother, we do not understand these things. We are told your religion was given to your forefathers. We also have a religion which was given to our forefathers. It teaches us to be *thankful* for all the favours we receive, to *love* one another, and to be *united*. We never quarrel about religion. We are told you have been preaching to the white people in this place. Those people are our neighbours: we are acquainted with them. We will wait a little, to see what effect your preaching has upon *them*. If we find it does them good, makes them *honest*, and *less* disposed to cheat Indians, we will then consider again what you have said." Thus closed the conference! Alas! poor people! how do our divisions and corruptions stand in your way? What a pity that you find us not upon original ground, such as the apostles left the primitive churches! Had we exhibited to you their unity and charity; their humble, honest, and affectionate deportment towards each other, and towards all men, you would not have had those evil and shameful things to object to our holy religion, and to prejudice your minds against it. But your conversion, it seems, awaits our reformation—awaits our return to primitive unity and love. To this may the God of mercy speedily restore us, both for your sakes and for our own; that *his* way may be known upon earth, and his saving health among all nations. Let the people praise thee, O God; let all the people praise thee. Amen and amen.

Upon the whole, we appeal to every candid mind, that has one serious thought upon the great subject of Christianity: is not the necessity of a religious reformation among professed Christians *most convincingly evident*, and *universally acknowledged*, by the serious of all denominations? We appeal, then, to all concerned, what should be its character? Should it be divine or human? Should it be the simple belief and obedience of the word and testimony of God, or of the opinions and dictates of men? You will, no doubt, say, Of the former. So say we; and yet, strange to tell, all the sects are offended. And why? We shall leave it to them to say; for they have

not yet, *no, not one of them*, presented any relevant reason, why we should desist from urging the indispensable duty, absolute necessity, and vast importance of the reformation for which we plead. They have not presented us with the detection of one single error in our premises. We shall conclude our humble appeal by respectfully assuring all concerned, that if they, or any of them, will convince us of any error, either of faith or practice, that we will candidly relinquish it, and thank God and man for the discovery. Also, that if they will show us how we may, without giving offence, plead the cause of a reformation, which involves the glory of God and the happiness of mankind, we shall thankfully adopt it.

For the assistance and satisfaction of our inquiring friends, who wish to avail themselves of the luminous fulness of the holy scriptures upon the great subject under consideration, we subjoin the following analysis of the sacred oracles, and the great salvation which they exhibit; by the due consideration of which the scriptural evidence and certainty of what is intended, will, we hope, be apparently obvious.

ANALYSIS OF THE SACRED ORACLES.

The Bible consists of two volumes—the Old Testament and the New. Each of these consists of histories, prophecies, moral dictates, divine institutions, and devotional exercises. The Old Testament contains three distinct dispensations of religion, and predicts a fourth, which is contained in the New; viz. 1st. The primitive or Edenic—delivered to our first parents immediately after their creation. 2d. The Patriarchal—also delivered to our first parents immediately after their fall. 3d. The Israelitish or Mosaic—delivered to the Israelites by Moses. And the 4th, called the Christian,—exclusively contained in the New Testament. Concerning these two volumes we observe, that although the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are inseparably connected, making together but one perfect and entire revelation of the divine will, for the edification and salvation of the church; and, therefore, in that respect cannot be separated: yet as to what directly and properly belongs to their immediate object, the New Testament is as perfect a constitution for the worship, discipline, and government of the New Testament church, and as perfect a rule for the particular duties of its members, as the Old Testament was for the worship, discipline, and government of the Old Testament church, and the particular duties of its members.

Also, that in order to enjoy a clear and comprehensive knowledge

of what we read upon every subject in the sacred volume, the following things should be duly considered: viz. Who speaks; to whom he speaks; what he says; why he says it; when; and where he said so.

ANALYSIS OF THE GRAND DOCTRINAL TOPICS CONTAINED IN THE BIBLE.

1. The knowledge of God. 2. Of man. 3. Of sin. 4. Of the Saviour. 5. Of his salvation. 6. Of the principle and means of enjoying it. 7. Of its blissful effects and consequences.

These are the grand doctrinal topics which the scriptures were specially designed to teach, in the knowledge, belief, and practical influence of which, consists our present salvation.

ANALYSIS OF THE GREAT SALVATION.

I. *Of its concurring causes.*—1. The prime moving or designing cause—the love of God. 2. The procuring cause—the blood of Christ. 3. The efficient cause—the Holy Spirit. 4. The instrumental cause—the gospel and law of Christ, or the word of truth.

II. *Of the principle and means of enjoyment.*

1. OF THE PRINCIPLE.

The sole principle of enjoyment is belief or faith.

2. OF THE MEANS.

1. The prime instituted means of enjoyment is baptism. 2. Prayer. 3. Church fellowship in the social ordinances. 4. The Lord's day. 5. The Lord's Supper. 6. The prayers. 7. The praises. 8. The teaching of the word. 9. The contribution for charitable purposes. 10. Religious conversation. 11. Studious perusal and meditation of the holy scriptures. 12. All manner of good works—called works of faith and labours of love, &c., all of which are but means of *enjoyment*—not of *procurement*. “For eternal life is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

III. *Of the present and proper effects of this salvation.*—These are justification, adoption, sanctification, assurance of God's love, peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Spirit, increase of grace, and perseverance in it to the end of our race.

IV. *Of its ultimate effects.*—These are a glorious resurrection, and a blissful immortality.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

BY THE REV. R. C. SHIMEALL,

RECTOR OF ST. JUDE'S EPISCOPALIAN FREE CHURCH, N. Y.

NUMERICALLY, the Episcopalians of this country, prior to the revolution, may be fitly compared to "an handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains." They were principally confined to the older colonial settlements of Maryland and Virginia, and in those of the south. To the north and east of Maryland, at the commencement of the revolution, the church had in her employment only about eighty parochial clergymen; all of whom, except those "resident in the towns of Boston and Newport, and the cities of New York and Philadelphia," derived their support from the society in England, instituted for the propagation of the gospel in foreign parts. In the entire province of Pennsylvania, the missionaries of this society never exceeded six in number.

Under the reign of James I., what the Puritans, through the instigation of Archbishop Bancroft failed to accomplish, in their attempt to migrate to the New World, they finally effected by obtaining a charter from the crown of England. The first emigrants consisted of a company of the Brownists, who, having retired to Holland, under the pastoral care of Mr. Robinson, resolved, A. D. 1620, to transport and nourish their religious sentiments in America. They settled at Plymouth.

The rigour and cruelty exercised by Bancroft and the high commissioners toward the separatists, has, not without reason, been considered by historians, as conducive to the troubles which ensued in the following reign, under Charles I. Laud, if he possessed not the ambition and the cruelty, yet he certainly inherited the spirit, and adopted the policy, of the above named zealous but misguided prelate. As an illustration of this fact, our limits will only allow us to record that, during the period of his administration of twelve years, no less than four thousand Puritans, whose principal object was—liberty to serve God in the way their consciences approved—migrated from

their native country, and, with those who had preceded them, from Holland, laid the foundation of a new nation in North America. Their places of settlement were, Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, and New Haven. Their chief leaders were non-conformist or Puritan ministers, who, "being hunted from one diocese to another, at last chose this wilderness for their retreat." Mr. Neale, their historian, speaks of a list of seventy-seven divines, "who became pastors of sundry little churches and congregations in America, before the year 1640, *all of whom were in orders in the Church of England*, men of strict sobriety and virtue; plain, serious, affectionate preachers, exactly conformable in sentiment to the doctrinal articles of the Church of England."

It is superfluous to add that, in the settlement of their ecclesiastical state in this western hemisphere, they adopted the *Congregational* form of ministry and government. And, as a consequence, and under the promptings of such fears, as the recollection of the past very naturally awakened, they looked with a jealous eye on the movements of that religious body, holding views in common with the Episcopal establishment of their "mother land." Of an "existing jealousy in the colonies, of the parent power," there can be no doubt. It formed the *germ* of the revolution. Hence their apprehension that the Episcopal Church might, at some future day, be an engine aiding in the introduction of a new system of colonial government.

It is also proper to remark, in this place, that other parts of Europe also contributed to the tide of emigration which was now populating the New World, of which, however, the German States were the principal. In 1623, a colony of the Dutch settled in this state, (New York,) then called "New Netherlands," and selected the southern extremity of Manhattan Island as their principal mart, to which they gave the name of New Amsterdam, now known as the city of New York. These, though "busily engaged in the pursuit of worldly gain, were by no means regardless of religion." Their first church was organized in this city (New York), A. D., 1639. Being planned under the immediate patronage of the Dutch West India Company, they very naturally solicited the aid of that body in procuring ministers for their churches. The ministers they supplied were ordained and sent forth by the Classis of Amsterdam, (Presbyterian,) with the approbation of the Synod of North Holland, to which that classis belongs. Through the medium of the same classis, the German Reformed Churches of Pennsylvania also procured their ministry from Germany; to which ecclesiastical body, both, accordingly, for the time being, were dependant and subordinate.

From 1639 to 1664, the period during which the colony was under the government of the West India Company, the Dutch Church in the New Netherlands was the established church. But in 1664, the colony surrendered to the forces of the British army, and came under the government of the Duke of York. To the Dutch inhabitants, however, though they lost their church establishment, yet at the time of the surrender, and afterwards in the treaty of peace, concluded in 1676, it was expressly stipulated, that the "rights of conscience with regard to worship and discipline," should be secured to them.

At the last mentioned period, the Dutch constituted the mass of the population in the state. In the colony, there were but few Episcopalians. These chiefly resided in the city of New York, and in the country immediately adjacent. They consisted, for the most part, of the officers of government and their dependants, and a portion of the military force. Indeed, the same was true of them elsewhere. Even in Maryland and Virginia, subsequently to the period of which we now speak, in all the more newly settled counties, the people for the most part were of other communions. Moreover, the Dutch were as well pre-eminent in wealth, as predominant in numbers, and embraced within the pale of their church, some of the most distinguished men in the colony, among whom was Governor Stuyvesant—a name as illustrious in our history, as it is rendered familiar to our ear, by those of his distinguished descendants of our city who still bear it.

Such was the situation of the Dutch Church, from 1664 to 1693. During the interval from 1639 to the year last mentioned, a number of churches were organized, besides those in New Amsterdam, Flatbush, New Utrecht, Flatlands, Esopus, and Albany; the ministers of the oldest and most conspicuous of which, viz. New Amsterdam, Esopus, and Albany, claimed and enjoyed a kind of *episcopal* dignity, having all the churches round them under their care, especially those which were not furnished with pastors; a prerogative exercised by them, not, as we may suppose, out of any leaning towards Diocesan Episcopacy, but that, under the circumstances, such supervision was deemed by them, not only expedient, but necessary.

Thus much, in reference to the church affairs of the emigrant Hollanders, is deemed essential to a proper understanding of the position of the Episcopal Church in this early period of the colony. The year 1693 marks the first step of her advance to ecclesiastical distinction. Under the auspices of "Colonel Benjamin Fletcher, who had been appointed governor the year before, a man of great ardour and boldness, and warmly attached to the Episcopal Church," a foundation was laid for a church establishment in her favour, which had been

lost to the Dutch since the surrender of the colony in 1664. To this measure the House of Assembly was at first decidedly hostile; and nought but the untiring vigilance of the governor secured the passage of an act in its favour. In Maryland and Virginia also, where, as we have said, the Episcopal Church was much more numerous, it had legal establishments for its support.

The advantages thence arising to the Episcopal Church, however, were not so great as might be supposed. Separated from the mother church by the Atlantic, with an unavoidably inefficient episcopal supervision;* the difficulties of obtaining regular and proper supplies of ministers for the churches; the consequent absence of wholesome discipline, and the constant jealousies of the proprietary government, particularly that of Maryland, of an encroachment of its ecclesiastical prerogatives by the Bishop of London; all tended in no small degree to cripple her otherwise inherent energies. In a word, she was virtually without an episcopal head, as the source of a regular supply of all the orders of the ministry, as recognised by her ecclesiastical system. That system, as is well known, involves the principle, that a succession from the apostles in the order of bishops, as an order distinct from, and superior to, presbyters, is a requisite without which a valid Christian ministry cannot be preserved.

At this stage of our advance, it becomes necessary to advert to the existence of another religious body, a knowledge of the circumstances of whose early origin and career in the colonies, as claiming an affinity, at least, to the order of ministry and polity of the Episcopal Church, is requisite to a proper view of the position of that church at the period to which we have just alluded. This body was the society of Methodists. Originating first in England, the seeds of Methodism were transplanted to the American colonies by their joint founders, the two Wesleys, John and Charles, who came to this country in the capacity of missionaries, in company with Gen. Oglethorpe, and arrived in Georgia, A. D. 1736. John took the charge of Savannah, and Charles of Frederica. Within a year and a half, however, they returned to England.

These clergymen were both regularly ordained presbyters of the English Episcopal Church. In the exercise of their functions, however, whether at home or abroad, their ministrations were adapted to what *they* considered a state of general declension of the life and power of religion in the established church. Their course, conse-

* The Bishop of London was considered as the diocesan of the Episcopal Churches in America.

quently, was marked by peculiarities which were deemed inconsistent with long established usages; and after their return, as above related, they "were no longer permitted to preach in the churches." They then had recourse to private houses, and adopted the system of field preaching. In the American colonies, their followers adopted a similar course. Multitudes in both countries attended upon their ministrations, and of those who officiated by the sufferance of the elder of the two brothers, the Rev. John Wesley, the reputed founder of the society.

The Rev. Charles Wesley, speaking of these times in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Chandler, bearing date April 28, 1785, says of himself and his brother, that "Their only design was to do all the good they could, as ministers of the Church of England, to which they were firmly attached, both by education and principle." Again speaking of himself, he says—"I never lost my dread of a separation, or ceased to guard our society against it." To which he adds: "I frequently told them, 'I am your servant as long as you remain members of the Church of England, but no longer. Should you ever *forsake* her, you *renounce* me.'" And, if we may judge from his nine notable "reasons for not separating from the church," as occasioned by the discovery of an early indication on the part of some of his lay-preachers to do so, the Rev. John Wesley was, during the most of his long, arduous, and eventful life, less opposed to such an event than his brother Charles. We regret that our limits will not allow us to transcribe them. We have only space for the following quotations, with which they are closed. Mr. Wesley says—"We look upon ourselves, not as the authors or ringleaders of a particular sect or party." "This would exceedingly obstruct the grand design for which we conceive God has raised them (the Methodists,) up." "We look upon the clergy, (i. e. of the English Church,) not only as part of our brethren, but as that part whom God, by his adorable providence, has called to be watchmen over the rest, for whom, therefore, they are to give a strict account." He also urges as a "prudential rule," that neither preachers nor people frequent any dissenting meeting, which, he says, "is actually separating from the church." And, he adds—"If it be said, 'But at the church we are fed with chaff; whereas, at the meeting we have wholesome food:' we answer—1st. The prayers of the church are not chaff; they are substantial food for any who are alive to God. 2d. The Lord's Supper is not chaff; but pure and wholesome for all who receive it with upright hearts. Yea,—3d. In almost all the sermons, we hear there, we hear many great and important truths. And whoever

has a spiritual discernment, may easily separate the chaff from the wheat therein." And 4th. As to the dissenters, they were either "new-light men," (Socinians,) or "predestinarians;" sufficient reasons, in his view, why they should avoid them. In conclusion, Mr. Wesley says: "In order to cut off all jealousy and suspicion from our friends, and hope from our enemies, of our having any design to separate from the church, it would be well for every Methodist preacher to attend the service of the church as often as conveniently he can." Adding: "The more we attend it, the more we love it, as constant experience shows," &c.

In England, the ordinary ministrations of the two Wesleys seem to have been conducted in strict accordance with the above principles. Writing to Dr. Chandler as above, the Rev. Charles Wesley says: "When we were no longer permitted to preach in the churches, we preached (but never in church hours,) in houses, or fields, and sent from thence, or rather carried, multitudes to church, who had never been there before. Our society, in most places, made the bulk of the congregation both at prayers and sacrament."

It is to be recollected, that at this period, and for a long time after, the preachers of the Methodist connexion in England, being only *laymen*, made no attempt at an infringement of the prerogatives of the established clergy. The same is true of those of them connected with the American colonies. Before the revolutionary war, they neither administered the sacraments, nor celebrated the rites of marriage. They considered themselves in no other light than as preachers of a religious society composed chiefly of members of the Episcopal Church, then called "The Church of England." They disclaimed the name of dissenters, as strenuously as the founders of their society had done.

In view of the above facts, therefore, the following question presents itself: Wherefore this dread on the part of these two eminent men, of a *separation* of the members of their society in England and in America, from the Church of England?

Our only source of reply is, the fact of their belief in, and practice of, the principle of Episcopacy,—that a succession from the apostles in the order of bishops, as an order distinct from, and superior to, presbyters, is a requisite, without which a valid Christian ministry cannot be preserved. On this subject the Rev. John Wesley, in his "Farther appeal to men of reason and religion," addressed the members of the Church of England in the following words:

"We do not dispute concerning any of the externals or circumstantials of religion. There is no room; for we agree with you

therein. We approve of, and adhere to them all; all that we learned together when we were children, in our catechism, and common prayer book. We were born and bred up in your own church, and desire to die therein. . . . We approve both the doctrines and discipline of our church, and inveigh only against ungodliness and unrighteousness," &c.

Now if we turn either to the English or the American "Book of Common Prayer," in the "preface" to the "form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons," we find the following:

"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons."

In accordance with the above, the Methodists in this country have declared the episcopal form of government to be the most excellent, and have adopted three distinct offices of ordination, for three distinct orders of ministers, viz: bishops or superintendents, elders or presbyters, and deacons. Thus, or to the following effect, in the office of deacons, they say, "O God, who hast appointed divine orders in thy church," &c.; in which they pray "that God would give his grace to this his servant, now called to the office of deacon." In the office for elders or presbyters, the same passages are found, the word elder or presbyter being substituted in the place of deacon. And in the office for bishops or superintendents, these words are substituted for elder or deacon.

We come now to observe that, up to the period when peace was established between Great Britain and the States, in the year 1783, the Methodist societies in both countries, on the principles above narrated, still exhibited an aversion to a separation from "the Church of England." During the war, Mr. Francis Asbury was the most distinguished preacher among them, in the colonies; and, under Mr. Wesley, (John,) was at the head of the Methodist societies in America. But, as we are informed by Dr. Coke and Mr. More, in their "Life of Wesley," "Mr. Asbury's attachment to the Episcopal Church of England was at that time exceeding strong."

But, at the conclusion of the war, in 1783, and for some time after, the Episcopal Church in the colonies, being destitute of the episcopate, could not organize. Added to this was the circumstance that, in the attempt to elevate the colonies to the rank of independent states, inasmuch as it involved the necessity of expunging from the Book of Common Prayer that part of it which related to the King of Great Britain, many able and worthy ministers, still cherishing their alle-

giance to their monarch, and entertaining conscientious scruples against the use of the Liturgy as amended, not only refused to officiate, but many of them sought an early opportunity to return to their own country. Thus the doors of the far greater number of the Episcopal churches were closed for several years.

Under these circumstances, the procurement of the episcopate, as a matter of course, became indispensable to the well-being of the church, in this country. For this purpose several applications were made to England, especially by the clergy of the northern colonies, for a supply of bishops from that quarter. This, however, only tended to awaken the jealousies of the people of other communions, founded upon the apprehension that they might be clothed with powers inconsistent with the principles on which the settlement of the colonies had taken place. And, although the clerical applicants of the colonies disclaimed all such intention, their endeavours met with the most determined opposition.

But this was a matter in which the society of Methodists also felt an interest. Nor, on the principle of their admission, as above, of the episcopal constitution of the church, and of their reiterated declarations of attachment to "the Church of England," and of their unwillingness to be separated from her, could it be otherwise. For it is obvious that, whatever change might be brought about in the political relations of the Episcopal Church, consequent upon the colonies having become independent of Great Britain, in the event of that church becoming possessed of the episcopate, there could be nothing to prevent the perpetuity of their connexion with her, either similar to that already existing, or perhaps one much better calculated to cement more closely the bonds of Christian union of the whole. Nor can it be doubted that this sentiment pervaded the minds of a large portion of that respectable body of Christians, at the period of which we now speak. Still, it is not to be denied, that during this unsettled state of affairs in the ecclesiastical condition of both bodies, the seeds of disunion had taken deep root. On this subject Drs. Coke and More, in their "Life of Wesley," state that :

"During the civil war the societies were destitute of the sacraments, except in two or three of the cities. They could not obtain baptism for their children, or the Lord's Supper for themselves, from the Presbyterian, Independent, or Baptist ministers, but upon condition that they would join those churches respectively; and many of the clergy of the Church of England had left the country. The societies in general were so grieved on this account, and so influenced the minds

of their preachers by their incessant complaints, that in the year 1778, a considerable number of them earnestly importuned Mr. Asbury to take prompt measures that the people might enjoy the privileges of all other churches, and no longer be deprived of the Christian sacraments. Mr. Asbury's attachment to the Church of England was at that time exceeding strong; he therefore refused them any redress. On this, the majority of the preachers withdrew from him, and consequently from Mr. Wesley, and chose out of themselves three senior brethren, who ordained others by the imposition of their hands. The preachers thus set apart administered the sacraments to those they judged proper to receive them, in every place where they came."

Thus originated, in the Methodist society, the first notable schism which marks their history in the American colonies. We have, however, the joint authority of the Rev. Mr. Coleman, in his "Life of Mr. Jarrat," and of Drs. Coke and More, certifying that this schism was finally suppressed by the agency of Mr. Asbury, he having procured a vote of one of the conferences, invalidating the above ordinations, at which time "a perfect reunion took place."

A review of the above transaction very naturally suggests an evident impropriety in these members of the Episcopal Church seeking the sacraments at the hands of those who, according to their avowed principles, were not of their communion; and especially when it is considered that the ground upon which they sought them was rather imaginary than real, there being at this very time in the province of Maryland at least eighteen clergymen of the English Church, and in that of Virginia many more.

Upon the elevation of the provinces into independent states in 1776, an intercourse was opened between the societies of both countries; and with it commenced a new era in the history of Methodism in this country. Alluding to this period, Dr. Coke and Mr. More inform us that, "Mr. Wesley received from Mr. Asbury a full account of the progress of the work during the war; and especially of the division which had taken place, and of the difficulties he met with, before it was healed. He also informed Mr. Wesley of the extreme uneasiness of the people's minds, for want of the sacraments; that thousands of their children were unbaptized; and that the members of the society in general had not partaken of the Lord's Supper for many years."

Upon the receipt of this communication, the above writers inform us that, "Mr. Wesley considered the subject, and informed Dr. Coke of his design of drawing up a plan of church government, and of

establishing an ordination, for his American societies. But cautious of entering on so new a plan, he afterwards suspended the execution of his purposes, and weighed the whole for upwards of a year."

It is here proper to observe, that Dr. Coke was at this time a presbyter of the Church of England, having received his ordination at the hand of the Bishop of London. Mr. Wesley was also a presbyter of the same church. And, upon the principles of Episcopacy, they were clothed with equal powers; but neither with the power to ordain others. But, as we are informed, "At the conference held in Leeds, 1784, he (Mr. Wesley) declared his intention of sending Dr. Coke and some other preachers to America. Mr. Richard Whatcoat and Mr. Thomas Vasey offered themselves as missionaries for that purpose, and were accepted. Before they sailed, Mr. Wesley abridged the Common Prayer Book, and wrote to Dr. Coke, then in London, desiring him to meet him in Bristol to receive *fuller powers*; and to bring the Rev. Mr. Creighton with him."

But the question presents itself: From whom was Dr. Coke to receive these fuller powers? Had the Bishop of London volunteered his services to that end? The following quotation from the same writers as above will decide:

"The Dr. (Coke) and Mr. Creighton accordingly met him (Mr. Wesley) in Bristol, July 27th, 1784, when, with their assistance, he (Mr. Wesley) ordained Mr. Richard Whatcoat and Mr. Thomas Vasey, presbyters for America: and he (Mr. Wesley) did afterwards ordain Dr. Coke, superintendent, giving him letters of ordination under his hand and seal, and at the same time a letter to be printed and circulated in America."

Mr. Wesley, therefore, though himself but a presbyter in the English Church, raises two gentlemen to the order of presbyters not only, but also confers "*fuller powers*" upon a fellow-presbyter, by conferring upon him the order of superintendent: a superior or "*fuller power*," originating from a source inferior to itself!

Bearing in mind that the record of these events is framed in view of the principle of Episcopacy as already laid down, and to which Mr. Wesley and his followers professed so strong an attachment: there is certainly nothing unreasonable in the expectation, that some reasons should be offered in justification of the above measure, by the apologists of that order. Such apologies have been offered. One, by Mr. Wesley in his own behalf, as contained in the letter given to Dr. Coke at the time of his ordination, and which was printed and circulated in America upon his arrival here; of which the following

is an extract. Speaking of the provinces after their erection into independent states, he says :

“ No one either exercises or claims any ecclesiastical authority (over them) at all. In this peculiar situation some thousands of the inhabitants of these States desire my advice; and in compliance with their desire I have drawn up a little sketch.

“ For many years I have been importuned from time to time, to exercise the right of ordaining part of our travelling preachers. But I have still refused : not only for peace’ sake, but because I was determined, as little as possible to violate the established order of the national church to which I belonged.

“ But the case is widely different between England and North America. Here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction. In America there are none within any parish ministry. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end : and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order, and invade no man’s right, by appointing and sending labourers into the harvest,” &c.

The misfortune, however, of this apology is, that though the exercise of these ordaining powers as assumed by Mr. Wesley were to take effect in America, yet they were performed in the presence, and consequently in direct violation of, laws, both legal and ecclesiastical, which his ordination vows as a presbyter of the English Church, bound him most solemnly to support. Above all, whatever changes might have been effected in the legal jurisdiction of the English bishops over the churches in the States, subsequently to their severance from Great Britain : the separation of the two countries by ten thousand oceans could never nullify his obligation to preserve inviolate an ecclesiastical constitution, to the scriptural and primitive character of which he had sworn allegiance.

Nor was Mr. Wesley ignorant of the doctrine of Episcopacy, as is evident from the following incident. Early in the year 1763, Erasmus, Bishop of Arcadia, in Crete, visited London. “ Mr. Wesley made inquiry concerning the reality of his office, and was fully satisfied that he was a true bishop. Mr. Wesley then applied to him to ordain Dr. Jones, in order to assist him in administering the Lord’s Supper to his societies, which he did.” It is clear from this circumstance, that Mr. Wesley was conscious of his want of power as a presbyter, to ordain Dr. Jones.

Again, as already observed, at the very time of the publication of the above circular, there were a considerable number of Episcopal clergymen in the States, at whose hands Mr. Wesley’s societies might have enjoyed the sacraments.

Nor is this all. So far as the provision of an episcopacy for the States was concerned, it was well known, at the time of the Bristol ordination, that Dr. Seabury had been nigh two years in England, to solicit episcopal consecration; and though in consequence of some legal difficulties, he failed in obtaining it from the English bishops, yet, repairing to Scotland, he soon after obtained it at the hands of three Scotch bishops.

In view of these circumstances, therefore, if not upon the ground of necessity, it has at least been thought expedient to attempt a justification of this assumption of episcopal prerogatives by Mr. Wesley on other grounds. Hence, while some have advanced the plea of his superior holiness to this end, others, as Dr. Phœbus, formerly of New York, have claimed for him an extraordinary mission, as a new apostle, &c.

Without intending any thing invidious, we shall pass over these apologists, with a view to an introduction of the reader to the position held by the Rev. Charles Wesley, relatively to the above transaction of his brother John. They had now walked together as "friends for above seventy years, and fellow-labourers for above fifty." In the same letter to Dr. Chandler, already alluded to, speaking of the Bristol ordination, he holds the following language: "For fifty years we kept the sheep in the fold." . . . "I can scarcely yet believe, that in his eighty-second year, my brother, my old intimate friend and companion, should have assumed the episcopal character, ordained elders, consecrated a bishop, and sent him to ordain lay-preaching in America. I was then in Bristol at his elbow; yet he never gave me the least hint of his intention." And he then demands,—“How was he surprised into so rash an action?”

In Dr. Whitehead's "Life of Wesley," he affirms that Dr. Coke wrote to Mr. Wesley, "urging him to ordain him bishop," &c.; of which transaction he says, "That the person who advised the measure, would be proved to have been a felon to Methodism, and to have stuck an assassinating knife into the vitals of its body."

These facts, to our mind, tend but to show the influence and ultimate triumph of importunity of an ambitious ecclesiastic, over the better judgment of one bending under the infirmity of old age. Yet, the Rev. Charles Wesley would almost seem to withhold from his aged brother the advantages of these extenuating circumstances; for he adds:

"Lord Mansfield told me last year, that ordination (i. e. by a presbyter,) was separation. This my brother does not, and will not see; or that he has renounced the principles and practices of his whole

life; that he has acted contrary to all his declarations, protestations and writings; robbed his friends of their boasting; realized the nag's head ordination; and left an indelible blot on his name, as long as it shall be remembered."

We now proceed to a brief allusion to the events which followed, upon the arrival of the newly consecrated superintendent (alias bishop) of the American Methodists in the States, accompanied by his two ordained missionaries. This was in the year 1784. To Mr. Dickens, the Methodist preacher then stationed in New York, Dr. Coke first opened Mr. Wesley's new plan of operations in America; and he earnestly pressed him to make it public. A few days after, the deputy and Mr. Asbury met for the first time; and upon a private disclosure of Mr. Wesley's new plan to him, Dr. Coke was not a little surprised to find Mr. Asbury expressing considerable doubts about it. Perhaps that gentleman had not yet lost all his exceeding strong attachment to the church. Nor, as it would seem, does the Doctor's mind appear to have been entirely free from doubts on this subject. Being exposed to considerable danger in crossing a broad ferry, Dec. 6th, of this year, he "prayed that God would drown him and take him to himself, if the peculiar work in which he was engaged was not for his glory."

However, the calling of a conference of all the preachers on the continent, at Baltimore, on the approaching Christmas Eve, resolved all doubts. This conference remained in session for ten days. Hampson, in his "Life of Wesley," records, that in a sermon preached on that occasion by Dr. Coke, was the following passage: "Though we admire the liturgy of the Church of England, and are determined to retain it with a few alterations; we cannot, we will not hold communion with them, till the holy spirit of God has made them see the evil of the practices and the importance of the doctrines above mentioned. And as for *this schism*, if it must have the name, we are cheerfully ready to answer for it at the bar of God."

A liturgy was accordingly appointed to be read on Sundays. (See Coke's Jour., Am. Mag. vol. i. p. 294.) But it was soon judged expedient to cast it aside as a dull, dead, lifeless form. In the above sermon they also rejoice that one "happy consequence" of the revolution "was the expulsion of most of those hirelings (the clergy of the Church of England), of which the society of the Methodists have till lately professed themselves a part." And, in respect to Mr. Wesley's authority, they say, "We are fully persuaded there is no church office which he judges expedient for the welfare of the people entrusted to his charge, but, as essential to his station, he has power to ordain."

In accordance, therefore, with this last sentiment, at this same conference, Dr. Coke, in the exercise of his "fuller powers," as received from Mr. Wesley, raised Mr. Asbury to the order of deacon; and, after two short intervals, to that of elder or presbyter, and superintendent or bishop. The derivation of the above order of bishops in the line of succession from the apostles, therefore, stands thus:—Mr. Asbury received his episcopal powers from the hands of Dr. Coke; Dr. Coke received his from the hands of Mr. Wesley; and Mr. Wesley received his from the hands of Mr. ———.

Hence the origin of Methodist Episcopacy in America. The above conference unanimously received Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury as their bishops!

During the progress of these events, as a late writer remarks, "The situation of the Episcopal Church was imminently critical. Deprived of some of her best clergy, depressed, and in some places obnoxious, serious were the apprehensions concerning her which agitated the bosoms of her friends. Jarring opinions also were to be reconciled. While some of her members were the zealous friends of Episcopacy, others of them were more lax in their opinions on this subject. The distressing situation of the church was increased by the doubt whether it would be in her power, for some considerable time at least, to obtain the episcopal succession. Two objects, therefore, appeared of consequence: to reconcile the dissonant opinions of her members on the subject of Episcopacy, and to preserve the church until the episcopal succession could be obtained."

Under these circumstances, Dr. White, of Philadelphia, in the year 1782, published a pamphlet entitled, "The case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States considered." In this pamphlet, he declares it as his opinion, "that their future continuance can be provided for only by voluntary associations for union and good government." With this view, and to meet the exigencies of the times, he offered the following, as "the outlines of a frame of church government." Dividing the continent into larger and smaller districts, he recommends the smaller to elect a general vestry or convention, consisting of a convenient number (the minister to be one) from the vestry or congregation of each church, or of every two or more churches, according to their respective ability for supporting a minister; that "they should elect a clergyman their permanent president, who, in conjunction with other clergymen, to be also appointed by the body, may exercise such powers as are purely spiritual, particularly that of admitting to the ministry." Some other plans for ecclesiastical legislation, not material to our present purpose, were also proposed. He proceeds to say: "The other part of the proposal, was an immediate

execution of the plan, without waiting for the episcopal succession. This," he says, "is founded on the presumption that the worship of God, and the instruction and reformation of the people, are the principal objects of ecclesiastical discipline; if so," he adds, "to relinquish them for a scrupulous adherence to Episcopacy, is sacrificing the substance to the ceremony." He continues, "It will be said, we ought to continue as we are, with the hope of obtaining it hereafter. But," he asks, "are the acknowledged ordinances of Christ's holy religion to be suspended for years, perhaps as long as the present generation shall continue, out of delicacy to a disputed point, (Episcopacy,) and that relating only to externals? It is submitted, how far such ideas encourage the suspicion of want of attachment to any particular church, except so far as it is subservient to some civil system. All the obligations of conformity to the divine ordinances, all the arguments which prove the connexion between public worship and the morals of a people, combine to urge the adopting some speedy measures to provide for the public ministry in these churches." And he closes by saying, "It would be to the greatest degree surprising, if the Church of England, acknowledged by all Protestant Churches to lay a sufficient stress on the essential doctrines and duties of the gospel, should be found so immoderately attached to a matter of *eternal* order, as must, in some cases, be ruinous to her communion. But, far from this, it will not be difficult to prove, that a temporary departure from Episcopacy, in the present instance, would be warranted by her doctrines, by her practice, and by the principles on which episcopal government is asserted."

Now, in view of the prescription of such a remedy for the prevalent evils of the Episcopal Church, one can scarcely resist the conviction, that the spirit of Wesley had descended upon Dr. White. At least, they will discover in it a sort of apology for the course pursued by the founder of Methodism and his adherents. It is undeniable that between the two schemes there are strong marks of resemblance. It must, however, be admitted, that in addition to many important differences in the circumstances of time, of place, and of persons, the latter scheme possessed at least one redeeming feature unknown to the former. Being based on the plea of necessity, it was only designed by its judicious projector as temporary. This is evident from various passages of Dr. White's pamphlet, and particularly from page 30, where, speaking of the opinion of Archbishop Usher, he says, "What part of the Christian world could the learned primate have named, of which it could have been so properly said as may be of ours, 'that ordination of bishops cannot be had?'"

Additional confirmation of this fact will appear as we advance,

from the repeated efforts made, and which finally proved successful, to procure an episcopate for the American Episcopal Church, through the channel of the English succession.

Two years after the publication of the above pamphlet, on the 13th and 14th of May, 1784, the first step was taken towards the forming of a collective body of the Episcopal Church in the United States. A meeting for this purpose was convened at New Brunswick, N. J., composed of a few clergymen from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Their plans, however, were not matured till the 5th of October ensuing, when, at an adjourned meeting in New York, in accordance with the extent of their vested powers, they happily and with great unanimity, laid down a few general principles, to be recommended in the respective states, as the ground on which a future ecclesiastical government should be established. These principles were approbatory of Episcopacy, and of the Book of Common Prayer, &c.

It is as well to remark in this place, that upon the acknowledgment of the independence of the States by Great Britain, in 1783, an incident occurred which encouraged the expectation that the episcopate might be obtained from the Danish Church. Through the agency of Mr. Adams, then the minister of the United States at the Court of St. James, several young gentlemen from the south, who had been educated for the ministry, and who had repaired to England to obtain orders, owing to the procrastination of their object by the Bishop of London, were ordained by that church. And as no other condition was required of them than merely the signing of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, it led to the presumption that there would have been an equal readiness, if desired, to consecrate our bishops. It appears, however, to have been the general resolve, inasmuch as the American churches had been planted under the English Episcopacy, to rely upon that source for her supply.

The general resolve, we say,—not the exclusive; for about the year 1782, the clergy of New England, and particularly those of Connecticut, determined upon the obtaining the episcopate; and though having sent the Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D., to England for consecration, yet on his return, about 1785, they received him as their diocesan, though consecrated by three non-juring bishops of the Scottish Church.

Soon after Bishop Seabury's return, the first General Convention of clerical and lay deputies from seven out of the thirteen states, met in Philadelphia, September 27, 1785. But so far as they entered on the business of the Episcopacy, although generally impressed with

sentiments of respect towards the new bishop, thought it the most proper to direct their views in the first instance towards England; some even venturing to take exceptions to the validity of his Episcopacy!* The circumstance, however, that the consecrators of Dr. Seabury were refugee bishops from England, having been ejected their sees on account of their refusal to take the oaths of the new government under William and Mary, most probably satisfied the minds of a majority of the clergy of that convention on this point.

"Having, therefore, determined upon a derivation of the Episcopacy of the American Church in a direct line from the English succession, the above convention proceeded to the appointment of a committee to correspond with the archbishops and bishops of that country on this subject; and, having certified to them in their address, that what was sought, did not interfere with any civil laws or constitutions of the States, and that consequently there was no danger of their embroiling themselves with the American government, the sovereignty of which they had so recently acknowledged, the apprehension of which on their part had constituted the main obstacle to the consecration of Dr. Seabury: they forwarded the same to the Archbishop of Canterbury, by the hand of his excellency John Adams, Esq., the American minister.

The address met with a favourable reception. And an answer was received by the committee early in the spring of 1786, signed by the two archbishops and eighteen of the twenty-four bishops of England.

* *Quære.* Could these gentlemen have fallen in with the following passage from Dr. Bernard, involving a doubt as to the consecration of the Scotch Bishops at their last restoration? It is to be found in his illustrations of Archbishop Usher's "Judgment of the Ordinations of the Reformed Churches," written in 1658. He says:

"If the ordinations of presbyters in such places where bishops cannot be had, were not valid, the late bishops of Scotland had a hard task to maintain themselves to be bishops, who were not (even) priests; for their ordination was no other. And for this a passage in the history of Scotland, wrote by the Archbishop of St. Andrews, is observable; that when the Scottish bishops were to be consecrated by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath, here at London House, Anno 1609, he saith a question was proved by Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, 'must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop.' The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained 'that thereof there was no necessity, seeing, where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise that it might be doubtful if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed churches.' This, applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced; and at the day, and in the place appointed, the three Scottish bishops were consecrated."

Dr. Bernard cites, as his authority for this story, Archbishop Spotiswode's "History of the Church of Scotland," from A. D. 203, to the end of the reign of James I. (Chris. Obs. vol. i. No. 10, p. 611.)

They, however, still deferred any definite action in the premises, till duly informed of the nature of the alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer. Such information having been collected soon after, by their inspection of a copy of that book, as demanded by the convention, the two archbishops again wrote to the committee, that besides some smaller alterations, they were particularly dissatisfied with the omission of the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds; and of the descent into hell of the Apostles' Creed. And also of an article in the proposed constitution, which seemed to them to subject the future bishops to trial by the presbyters and the laymen, in the respective states. These points satisfactorily explained, the committee were notified of the probable passage of an act of Parliament, authorizing them to consecrate for America, any clergymen bearing the proper credentials as to character, faith, learning, &c.

At a meeting of the second General Convention in Philadelphia, June 20th, 1786, together with an adjourned meeting held on the 10th of October following, the above objections of the English prelates were removed, by the assurance, that in reference to the article in the constitution respecting the trial of bishops, the provision for the presidency of a bishop in conventions and in ecclesiastical trials, more than done away the ground of that censure. That the Nicene Creed had been restored. Also, the clause in the Apostles' Creed, of the descent into hell. But, that they still persisted in the rejection of the Athanasian Creed: all of which had been preceded by the declaration of their determination not to depart from the doctrines of the English Church, nor to make any further alterations than such as appeared conducive to union.

Having received intelligence from the Archbishop of Canterbury, of the passage of an act by Parliament, authorizing the consecration of American bishops, the following persons were duly chosen for that office, viz.:

Dr. Samuel Provoost, Rector of Trinity Church, New York; Dr. Wm. White, Rector of Christ Church, and of St. Peter's, in the city of Philadelphia; and Dr. David Griffith, Rector of Fairfax Parish, Virginia, each by their respective conventions. This latter gentleman, owing to occurrences in his domestic situation, resigned. The two other clergymen embarked for London early in November of 1786, and were consecrated in the Chapel of the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth.

Thus the episcopate, in the line of succession from the English Church, was finally secured to the American branch, of which the following is a tabular view, from A. D. 1784 to A. D. 1843, inclusive:

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS IN THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

Name of Bishop.	Name of See.	Place of Consecration.	Date of Consecration.	Names of Consecrators.	When Deceased.
Samuel Seabury.	Connecticut.	Aberdeen.	Nov. 14, 1784.	Robert Kilgour. Arthur Petrie. John Skinner. <i>Scottish Bishops.</i>	Feb. 25, 1796.
William White. S. Provoost.	Pennsylvania New York.	England.	Feb. 4, 1787.	John Moore. Wm. Markham. Charles Moss. John Hinchcliffe. <i>English Bishops.</i>	July 17, 1836. Sept. 6, 1815.
James Madison.	Virginia.	Do.	Sept. 19, 1790.	John Moore. Beilby Porteus. John Thomas. <i>ibid.</i>	March 6, 1812.
T. J. Claggett.	Maryland.	New York.	Sept. 17, 1792.	Samuel Provoost. Samuel Seabury. William White. James Madison. William White.	Aug. 2, 1816.
Robert Smith.	S. Carolina.	Philadelphia.	Sept. 13, 1795.	Samuel Provoost. James Madison. T. J. Claggett. William White.	Oct. 28, 1801.
Edward Bass.	Mass.	Do.	May 7, 1797.	Samuel Provoost. T. J. Claggett. William White.	Sept. 10, 1803.
Abraham Jarvis.	Connecticut.	New Haven.	Oct. 18, 1797.	Samuel Provoost. Edward Bass. William White.	May 3, 1803.
Benjamin Moore.	New York.	Trenton, N.J.	Sept. 11, 1801.	T. J. Claggett. Abraham Jarvis. William White.	Feb. 27, 1816.
Samuel Parker.	Mass.	New York.	Sept. 14, 1804.	T. J. Claggett. Abraham Jarvis. Benjamin Moore.	Dec. 6, 1804.
John H. Hobart. A. V. Griswold.	New York. East. Diocese.	Do. Do.	May 29, 1811.	William White. Samuel Provoost. Abraham Jarvis. William White.	Sept. 12, 1830.
Theodore Dehon.	S. Carolina.	Philadelphia.	Oct. 15, 1812.	Abraham Jarvis. John H. Hobart. William White.	Aug. 6, 1817.
R. C. Moore.	Virginia.	Do.	May 18, 1814.	John H. Hobart. A. V. Griswold. Theodore Dehon. William White.	Nov. 11, 1841.
James Kemp.	Maryland.	New Brunswick, N. J.	Sept. 1, 1814.	John H. Hobart. Richard C. Moore.	Oct. 28, 1827.
John Croes.	New Jersey.	Philadelphia.	Nov. 19, 1815.	William White. John H. Hobart. James Kemp.	July 30, 1832.
Nath. Bowen.	S. Carolina.	Do.	Oct. 8, 1818.	William White. John H. Hobart. James Kemp. John Croes.	Aug. 25, 1839.
Philander Chase.	Ohio.	Do.	Feb. 11, 1819.	William White. John H. Hobart. James Kemp.	
T. C. Brownell.	Connecticut.	New Haven.	Oct. 27, 1819.	John Croes. William White. A. V. Griswold. William White.	
J. S. Ravenscroft.	N. Carolina.	Philadelphia.	May 22, 1823.	A. V. Griswold. James Kemp. John Croes. Nathaniel Bowen. T. C. Brownell.	March 5, 1830.

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS IN THE AMERICAN CHURCH—CONTINUED.

Name of Bishop.	Name of See.	Place of Consecration.	Date of Consecration.	Names of Consecrators.	When Deceased.
H. U. Onderdonk.	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia.	Oct. 25, 1827.	William White. John H. Hobart. James Kemp. John Croes. Nathaniel Bowen.	
William Meade.	Virginia.	Do.	Aug. 19, 1829.	William White. John H. Hobart. A. V. Griswold. Richard C. Moore. John Croes. T. C. Brownell. H. U. Onderdonk.	
Wm. M. Stone.	Maryland.	Baltimore.	Oct. 21, 1830.	William White. Richard C. Moore. H. U. Onderdonk. William Meade.	Feb. 26, 1833.
B. T. Onderdonk.	New York.	New York.	Nov. 26, 1830.	William White. T. C. Brownell. H. U. Onderdonk.	
Levi S. Ives.	N. Carolina.	Philadelphia.	Sept. 22, 1831.	William White. H. U. Onderdonk. B. T. Onderdonk.	
John H. Hopkins.	Vermont.	New York.	Oct. 31, 1832.	William White. A. V. Griswold. Nathaniel Bowen.	
Benj. B. Smith.	Kentucky.	Do.	Oct. 31, 1832.	William White. T. C. Brownell. H. U. Onderdonk.	
C. P. McIlvaine.	Ohio.	Do.	Oct. 31, 1832.	William White. A. V. Griswold. William Meade.	
Geo. W. Doane.	New Jersey.	Do.	Oct. 31, 1832.	William White. B. T. Onderdonk. Levi S. Ives.	
James H. Otey.	Tennessee.	Philadelphia.	Jan. 14, 1834.	William White. H. U. Onderdonk. B. T. Onderdonk. George W. Doane.	
Jackson Kemper.	Missouri and Indiana.	Do.	Sept. 25, 1835.	William White. Richard C. Moore. Philander Chase. H. U. Onderdonk. B. T. Onderdonk. Benj. B. Smith. George W. Doane.	
S. A. McCoskry.	Michigan.	Do.	July 7, 1836.	H. U. Onderdonk. George W. Doane. Jackson Kemper.	
Leonidas Polk.	Arkansas.	Cincinnati, O.	Dec. 9, 1838.	William Meade. Benj. B. Smith. C. P. McIlvaine. James H. Otey.	
W. H. De Lancey.	W. N. York.	Auburn, N.Y.	May 9, 1839.	A. V. Griswold. H. U. Onderdonk. B. T. Onderdonk. George W. Doane.	
C. E. Gadsden.	S. Carolina.	Boston.	June 21, 1840.	A. V. Griswold. George W. Doane. S. A. McCoskry.	
William R. Whittingham.	Maryland.	Baltimore.	Sept. 17, 1840.	A. V. Griswold. Richard C. Moore. B. T. Onderdonk. George W. Doane.	
Stephen Elliott.	Georgia.	Savannah.	Feb. 28, 1841.	William Meade. Levi S. Ives. C. E. Gadsden.	

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS IN THE AMERICAN CHURCH—CONCLUDED.

Name of Bishop.	Name of Sec.	Place of Consecration.	Date of Consecration.	Names of Consecrators.	When Deceased.
Alfred Lee.	Delaware.	New York.	Oct. 12, 1841.	{ A. V. Griswold. Richard C. Moore. Philander Chase. T. C. Brownell. H. U. Onderdonk.	
John Johns.	Virginia.	Richmond.	Oct. 13, 1842.	{ A. V. Griswold. William Meade. Levi S. Ives. W. R. Whittingham	
Man. Eastburn.	Mass.	Boston.	Dec. 29, 1842.	{ A. V. Griswold. T. C. Brownell. B. T. Onderdonk. W. H. De Lancey.	
J. P. K. Henshaw.	Rhode Island.	Providence.	Aug. 11, 1843.	{ T. C. Brownell. B. T. Onderdonk. John H. Hopkins. George W. Doane. W. R. Whittingham John Johns.	

The third General Convention (triennial), composed of the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, was held in Philadelphia, July 28, 1789, which sat for ten days. Bishop White only was present, Bishop Provoost being detained by sickness. The first act of the convention was, to recognise the consecration of these two bishops. The next, to perpetuate the succession. This matter again involved the question of the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration, a test of which was furnished at hand, by the election of the Rev. Edward Bass, rector of St. Paul's Church in Newburyport, their bishop, and requesting the bishops of Connecticut, New York, and Pennsylvania, to unite in consecrating him. But, though the convention, with their president, voted an opinion in favour of the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration; still, before they felt themselves warranted in conferring the office upon an American candidate, they awaited the return from England of the Rev. Dr. Madison, who had been sent thither for consecration as the bishop elect of the Convention of Virginia. Before the adjournment of the convention, however, an invitation was given to Bishop Seabury, and the eastern brethren generally, to attend the next session, to be held on the 29th of September ensuing, with a view to a permanent union; which invitation was accepted. The credentials of Bishop Seabury's consecration were presented and acknowledged, and after one alteration of the constitution at their desire, they declared their acquiescence in it, and gave it their signatures accordingly. Suffice it to add on this subject, that

after Bishop Madison's return from England, the first consecration which took place in the American Episcopal Church, was that of the Rev. Dr. Thomas John Claggett, elected by the Convention of Maryland in 1792, and that Bishop Seabury united with Bishops White, Provoost, and Madison, in that act.

During the convention of 1789, the constitution formed in 1786 was reviewed and new modelled. The principal feature now given to it, was a distribution into two houses; the House of Bishops, and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, who were to vote by orders when required. The convention was to meet triennially, on the second Tuesday in September.

At this convention the Liturgy was reviewed and amended as we now find it. Some canons previously passed were also reconsidered and adopted or amended; and others were added from time to time at subsequent conventions, till they have assumed the form in which they now appear in the "Journal of the General Convention, together with the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," for the year 1841. It is, however, perhaps, worthy of observation, that at the General Convention of 1792, the greater part of the time of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, was taken up with debates on the proposed absolute negative of the bishops. This fact, however, is not recorded in the journal for that year. Why not? And then, in addition, we are told, that the debates were conducted without any interference on the part of the bishops. How modest! The final determination of the question was deferred to the next convention.

From the preceding, the attentive reader cannot fail to discover the existence, prior to the introduction of the episcopate in the American Church, of an "excessive fear," even amongst churchmen, of episcopal domination, so that there was at first absolutely a vigorous opposition to having any bishops established on this side of the water. Such would also do well to "remember the time when the bishops were not allowed to constitute a co-ordinate branch of the general legislature of the church at all." That "they were only private members of the General Convention;" and "that even after the House of Bishops was established, it was by slow degrees, and in the face of wakeful opposition, that they attained a legislative equality with what has since been called the 'lower house.' An arrangement by which three men could counterbalance, at any time, the assembled representation of the church at large."

The closing events of this compend will furnish occasion for further remarks on this subject.

At the above convention, the action of the bishops in reference to the Ordinal, resulted in the adoption of the English form, except that the words used at the ordination of priests, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," and "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained," resulted in the adoption of a double form, to be used at the discretion of the officiating bishop: Bishop White understanding the first to signify the conveyance of the ministerial character; and of the second the power of passing ecclesiastical censures, and of releasing from them, and as placing the efficacy of the act of absolution from sin on the condition of sincere repentance, &c.; while Bishop Seabury contended that both acts were absolute, as well that of the priest as of the bishop.

OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH.

These are to be found in the Creeds, in the Liturgy, and in the Thirty-nine Articles, &c. of the church.

Of the legislation of the church in reference to their final adoption, in addition to what has been already said respecting the article in the Apostles' Creed touching the descent into hell, and the rejection of the Athanasian Creed, it must suffice that we add that, at this convention, Bishop Provoost being in the chair, expressed no opinion. It was, however, supposed that he united with Bishop Madison in the opinion against articles altogether, on the ground of the approximation to the principles of the confessional and the like books.

Bishop Seabury, though at first opposed to any authoritative rule in the form of public confession, on the ground that all necessary doctrine should be comprehended in the Liturgy; yet at last yielded the point, and united with Bishop White and Claggett in the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles; not, however, without expressing his dissatisfaction with some of them.

Bishop White not only expressed himself an advocate for articles, but that, all things considered, the Thirty-nine Articles were the best rule that could be devised. He did not, however, wish to have them signed, as in England, according to the tenor of the thirty-sixth canon of that church. He preferred the resting of the obligation of them on the promise made at ordination, as required by the seventh article of the constitution of the American Church, as adopted in the convention of Sept. 29, 1789; which, being considered as sufficient by the English bishops, would contribute more effectually to promote the peace of the American Church. And, although in his private judgment, some of them might have been advantageously omitted, and others altered,

yet they were finally adopted, and have remained as we now find them in the Book of Common Prayer.

Another matter of interest in the history of the American Episcopal Church, now presents itself. It consisted of an attempt made during the session of this convention, to effect a reunion with the Methodists. In this attempt Bishop Madison bore a conspicuous part. It proved a failure. This, however, is to be attributed neither to a want of disposition on the part of the convention to encourage the well-meant design of the bishop, nor to a want of readiness on the part of a large portion of the Methodist body to acquiesce therein. What determined the decision of the convention in considering the proposition as preposterous, was an absolute distrust of the motives which actuated the movements of the leading spirit of the Methodist Society, in seeking such an alliance. We now allude to Dr. Coke. The Episcopal community was not ignorant of the circumstances, as already related, under which, as superintendent of that society, he had derived from the hands of Mr. Wesley his "fuller powers." Nor had they forgotten the language of his sermon before their conference of Nov. 14, 1784, by which that society was severed from all further connexion with the Episcopal Church: "We cannot, we will not hold further communion with them." Nor did they overlook the fact of a conference being held between Dr. Andrews and Mr. West of the Episcopal Church, and Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, at Baltimore; the object of which, on the part of the former, was the security to the Methodist Society, of the episcopal succession in a regular way, which it was intimated might be obtained, and they still be left to manage their own affairs in their own way; and its pertinacious rejection by the latter. When, therefore, the above proposition was submitted to the convention by Bishop Madison, it resulted in the disclosure by Bishop White, of a letter written to him by Dr. Coke, the purport of which was, a proposal for reunion of the Methodist Society with the Episcopal Church.

The plan was, in substance, that all the Methodist ministers, at that time in connexion, were to receive episcopal ordination, as also those who should come forward in future within the connexion; such ministry to remain under the government of the then superintendents and their successors. And, in subsequent interviews on this subject, it was intimated by Dr. Coke, that it would also be expected that he and his coadjutor Mr. Asbury, (between whom and himself there were indications of a growing jealousy,) should receive episcopal consecration. In the above letter also, (a copy of which is now before me,) Dr. Coke most penitentially acknowledges, that *he* had gone further

in the separation than had been designed by Mr. Wesley, from whom he had received his commission; that Mr. Wesley himself, he was sure, had gone further than he would have gone, if he had foreseen some events which followed, and that he was sorry for the separation, and would use his influence to the utmost, for the accomplishment of a reunion; and, finally, that he (Dr. Coke) had been guilty of inadvertencies, both in reference to his conduct towards the Rev. Mr. Jarrat, (an Episcopal clergyman,) Bishop White, and the Rev. Dr. Magaw, to the first of whom he had written "a penitential letter," and closes by saying, "I sincerely beg your and Dr. Magaw's pardon."

These circumstances, suffice it to say, determined the convention to dismiss all further consideration of the subject. Bishop Madison silently withdrew his proposal for a reunion, agreeably to leave given.

STATISTICS.

Of the various institutions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States, the following are the principals, viz:

I. THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.—This institution was first established in New York in 1817. It was removed to New Haven in 1820, but the next year, being incorporated with the Theological Seminary of the Diocese of New York, was again removed to this city, when its present organization commenced. Between the years 1819 and 1843, its number of students advanced from 26, to 67.

Beside the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, located at New York, there are also several diocesan institutions for the study of divinity. One of the most prominent of these is located at Gambier, Ohio; another at Alexandria, in the District of Columbia; and a third at Lexington, Kentucky.

II. THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—This society was first instituted in 1820, and was re-organized in 1835. The board of managers at present consists of 118 members, and has two standing committees, viz: "The Committee for Domestic Missions," and "The Committee for Foreign Missions." To the above board belongs the supervision of the general missionary operations of the church. Its meetings are annual and triennial.

The stations in the Domestic Department, as reported in June, 1842, are the following:

Two missionary bishops, appointed by the General Convention, are connected with this department.

1. INDIAN MISSIONS.—Duck Creek, 1 missionary, 2 female assistants; Green Bay, 2 female and 1 male assistant.

2. NORTHERN MISSIONS.—Maine, 3 stations, 2 missionaries; New Hampshire, 1 station, 1 missionary; Delaware, 1 station, 1 missionary; Ohio, 5 stations, 4 missionaries; Michigan, 13 stations, 11 missionaries; Indiana, 17 stations, 8 missionaries; Wisconsin, 12 stations, 8 missionaries; Iowa, 7 stations, 3 missionaries; Missouri, 12 stations, 5 missionaries; Illinois, 15 stations, 9 missionaries.

SOUTHERN MISSIONS.—Kentucky, 5 stations, 5 missionaries; Tennessee, 7 stations, 4 missionaries; Georgia, 2 stations, no missionary; Florida, 5 stations, 2 missionaries; Alabama, 12 stations, 4 missionaries; Mississippi, 9 stations, 4 missionaries; Arkansas, 7 stations, 3 missionaries; Louisiana, 4 stations, 1 missionary.

STATIONS IN THE FOREIGN DEPARTMENT, reported June, 1840:

1. WESTERN AFRICA.—4 missionaries (3 married), 2 male and 1 female assistants.

2. CHINA.—1 missionary (married).

3. EASTERN MISSIONS.—Athens, 1 missionary (married), and 3 female assistants; Crete, 1 missionary (married), and 1 female assistant; Constantinople and Mardin, 2 missionaries (married).

4. TEXAS.—2 missionaries (1 married).

Receipts in the domestic department for 1842-3, \$38,835 60. Expenditures, \$36,238 64.

Receipts in the foreign department, 1842-3, \$35,198 50. Expenditures, \$37,330 05.

Official organ—"The Spirit of Missions."

III. THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.—Instituted 1817. Depository, New York. The Union publishes books for Sunday School instruction, and Sunday School Libraries; and also the Children's Magazine, and the Journal of Christian Education.

IV. THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY.—Instituted A. D. 1810.

V. THE DIOCESAN INSTITUTIONS are the following:

New York.—Columbia College, Trinity School, St. Paul's College and Grammar School, College Point, Flushing, L. I., and St. Ann's Hall, Flushing, L. I. Also,

The Protestant Episcopal Society for the promotion of Religion and Learning, Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of

Clergymen, New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, Education and Missionary Society, City Mission Society, &c.

Western New York.—Geneva College; Hobart Hall Institute; Holland Patent, Oneida county; Episcopal Seminary for Young Ladies, Lockport, Niagara county.

Massachusetts.—Board of Missions.

Connecticut.—Washington College, Hartford; Connecticut Episcopal Academy, Cheshire; Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; Church Scholarship Society.

New Jersey.—Offerings of the Church; St. Mary's Hall, Burlington; St. Matthew's Hall, Port Colden, Warren county.

Pennsylvania.—Society for the Advancement of Christianity; Bishop White Prayer Book Society.

Virginia.—Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary; Episcopal High School; Protestant Episcopal Association for the Promotion of Christianity.

Ohio.—Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary; Kenyon College; Senior Preparatory School; Milnor Hall, or Junior Preparatory School.

Tennessee.—Columbia Female Institute.

Illinois.—Jubilee College.

Missouri.—Kemper College.

The following table shows the progress of the church: exhibiting the population and the number of the clergy in each Diocese, at *six* successive periods, from A. D. 1792, to A. D. 1843, inclusive.

Diocese.	Extent in sq. miles.	Population in 1790.	Clergy in 1792.	Population in 1800.	Clergy in 1801.	Population in 1810.	Clergy in 1811.	Population in 1820.	Clergy in 1820.	Population in 1830.	Clergy in 1832.	Population in 1843.	Clergy in 1843.
Maine.	32,000	96,540	.	151,719	.	228,705	.	298,335	2	399,445	4	501,793	6
New Hampshire.	9,280	141,885	no list.	183,858	3	214,460	5	244,161	4	269,328	8	284,574	10
Massachusetts.	7,800	348,787	no list.	422,845	9	472,040	8	523,287	12	610,408	33	637,639	36
Rhode Island.	1,095	68,825	2	69,122	5	76,931	3	83,059	7	97,199	7	108,830	25
Vermont.	10,200	85,539	.	154,465	.	217,895	2	235,764	5	280,657	9	291,948	29
Connecticut.	4,800	237,946	22	251,002	29	261,942	31	275,248	39	297,675	57	310,015	102
New York.	46,000	340,120	19	556,050	23	959,049	47	1,372,812	75	1,918,608	129	2,493,783	202
New Jersey.	7,800	184,139	9	211,149	7	245,562	8	277,575	15	320,823	20	373,366	47
Pennsylvania.	47,000	434,373	14	602,545	16	810,091	21	1,049,313	28	1,348,233	63	1,724,032	115
Delaware.	2,100	59,094	3	64,273	4	72,674	no list.	72,749	4	76,739	7	78,085	11
Maryland.	10,930	317,728	33	345,824	38	380,546	35	407,350	48	446,913	49	469,232	93
Virginia.	66,000	747,610	61	880,200	58	974,632	no list.	1,065,366	29	1,211,375	42	1,239,797	98
North Carolina.	50,000	393,951	.	478,103	.	555,500	.	638,829	7	738,470	13	753,110	32
South Carolina.	33,000	249,073	15	345,591	.	415,115	16	502,741	27	581,458	35	594,398	49
Georgia.	60,000	82,548	.	162,686	.	252,433	1	348,989	no list.	516,567	3	770,000	14
Ohio.	50,000	3,000	.	45,365	.	230,760	.	581,434	7	937,903	14	1,519,467	62
Kentucky.	40,000	73,677	.	220,959	.	406,511	.	564,317	.	688,844	3	790,000	22
Mississippi.	50,000	no cens.	.	no cens.	.	no cens.	.	75,448	.	136,800	3	375,651	11
Tennessee.	40,000	.	.	105,602	.	261,727	.	420,813	.	681,903	3	829,210	12
Alabama.	50,000	127,901	.	309,527	1	650,000	10
Michigan.	55,000	31,639	2	211,705	24
Louisiana.	48,220	351,176	7
Illinois.	59,500	474,404	14
Florida.	47,750	54,207	4
Indiana.	35,000	683,317	15
Missouri.	64,000	381,102	10
Wisconsin.	30,852	11
Iowa.	43,068	4
Arkansas.	58,000	95,642	2
Western New York.	105

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

This much then of the facts and incidents connected with the rise and progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States. At first a feeble band, she is called to the endurance of a great fight of affliction; and, at one period, reduced to an extremity which perilled her very existence. The jealousies which were awakened in the colonies by her union with the state in 1693, more than counterbalanced the short-lived advantages she derived from the protection and support of the British crown. This is evident from a view of her position, immediately following the recognition of the independence of the States in 1783. That event, dissolving her connexion with the state, subjected her on the one hand to the loss of many of her ablest clergy, and on the other, to the scorn and derision of opposing sects. Not that she could not at this very time, strictly speaking, compare with any other religious body in point of numbers, the members of the Methodist Society, up to the year 1784, constituting a part of her communion.

Five events mainly distinguish the history, and may be considered as affecting the interests of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, from her earliest connexion with the colonies, to the present time.

The *first*, was her erection into a church establishment in 1693. This circumstance secured to her a temporary ascendancy, especially in the province of New York. From that period, accessions were made to her communion, and not a few from among the original emigrants, the Hollanders; some, doubtless, for conscience' sake, but more, we fear, from mercenary motives, or from considerations of state policy.

The *second*, was the severance of the Methodist Society from her communion; a circumstance, which, if we mistake not, viewed in any light, furnishes an occasion of the deepest regret.

The *third* was the dissolution of the church establishments, consequent upon the recognition of the independence of the colonies by Great Britain in 1783; the effects of which, as it relates to the best interests of the church, can be measured only by being thrown in contrast with the folly of erecting into a church establishment any one religious body, amid so many discordant and hostile elements, social, civil, political, and ecclesiastical.

The *fourth*, the procurement, in 1793, of the episcopate through

the English line of succession. This event precluded the necessity of that temporary departure from Episcopacy, proposed by Dr. White, in order to meet the supposed exigency of the church in 1782.

Henceforward, the Protestant Episcopal Church, thus duly organized, with her apostolic ministry, her liturgy, her diocesan and general conventions, her constitutions and canons, &c. &c., gradually advanced into a consolidation of her distinctive principles; till—to the praise of God's grace be it spoken—she has realized the truth, (in a subordinate sense at least,) “a little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation.” (Isa. lx. 22.)

EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION.

BY THE REV. W. W. ORWIG,

NEW BERLIN, UNION COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.

THIS Christian denomination took its rise about the year 1800, in one of the middle free States of America ; at first they were called the Albrights, (Albrechtsleute), probably on account of Jacob Albright having been, by the grace of God, the instrument of their solemnly uniting themselves for the service of Almighty God. About the year 1790, Jacob Albright became the happy subject of the awakening influences of God's Holy Spirit, and was brought to the knowledge of his sinful state and of the truth ; and after a long and very severe struggle, he received at last, by faith in the Son of God, the remission of his sins and the spirit of adoption. In this state he spent several years in the service of God ; and, at the request of his fellow-Christians, he at sundry times spake publicly a word of exhortation, which did not remain fruitless. In the year 1796, after a very severe conflict respecting his call to the ministry, he commenced travelling through the country, and to preach the gospel of Christ, and him crucified, to his fellow-men, and the Lord owned and richly blessed his labours, and gave him many souls for his recompense. Having now continually a feeling and tender regard for the Germans of this country, as among them true Christianity was at that time at a very low ebb and almost entirely extirpated : he united himself in the year 1800 with a number of persons, who by his preaching had been awakened and converted to God, into a Christian society. This is the origin of the Evangelical Association. In the year 1803 this society resolved upon introducing and instituting among, and for, themselves an ecclesiastical regulation. Jacob Albright was therefore elected as the presiding elder among them, and duly confirmed by the other preachers, and by their laying on of hands ordained, so as to authorize him to perform all transactions that are necessary for a Christian society, and becoming to an evangelical preacher. They unanimously chose

the sacred scriptures for their guide in faith and action, and formed their church discipline accordingly, as any one may see, who will take the pains to investigate and examine the same. At first, indeed, when their principles and design were not yet much known, this denomination met with considerable opposition and suffered much persecution; it, however, spread more and more till to the present time, but more especially during the last ten years. At present (1843,) their number is near 15,000 communicants, and between two and three hundred preachers, of whom there are above one hundred travelling preachers. Hitherto they have confined their labours chiefly to the German population of the United States and the Canadas, and have for some time past been very successful in their missions among the emigrated Germans in the western States, and in several of the principal seaports of this country. The following is a compend of their unanimous doctrine and confession of faith.

ARTICLES OF FAITH.

I. *Of the Holy Trinity.*—There is but one only, true and living God, an eternal Being, a Spirit without a body, indivisible, infinite, mighty, wise and good, the creator and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in this Godhead there is a trinity, of one substance and power, and co-eternal; namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. *Concerning the Word, or Son of God, who became Man.*—The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the eternal and true God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, so that both natures, the divine and the human, are perfectly and inseparably joined together in him (as in one person); therefore he is Christ (the anointed) very God and very man, even he, who suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, in order to reconcile the justice of the eternal Father with us, and to present himself a sacrifice for both our original and actual sins.

III. *Of Christ's Resurrection.*—This Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and reassumed his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, and thus in the same body he ascended into heaven, and sitteth there until he return again, at the last day, to judge all men.

IV. *Of the Holy Ghost.*—The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, is the true and eternal God, of one substance, majesty and glory, with the Father and the Son.

V. *The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for our Instruction to Sal-*

vation.—The Holy Scriptures contain the decree of God, so far as it is necessary for us to know for our salvation; so that whatsoever is not contained therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be enjoined on any to believe as an article of faith, nor as a doctrine essential to salvation.

By the Holy Scriptures, we understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, which the church at all times indubiously received as such.

VI. *Concerning the Old Testament*.—The Old and New Testaments are not contrary to each other; in both, as well in the Old as in the New Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, being both God and man, and the only Mediator between God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, who teach that the fathers of the ancient covenant had grounded their expectations on transitory promises only. Though the law given from God by Moses, touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians by any means, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth: yet, notwithstanding, no Christian is free from the obedience of the ten commandments, which are also called the moral law.

VII. *Of Original Sin*.—Original sin consisteth not in the following of Adam (as some falsely pretend); but it is that corruption of the human nature, in which every offspring of Adam appears in this world—a corruption, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and, on the contrary, is of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

VIII. *Of Free Will*.—The condition of man after and since the fall of Adam is so wretched, that we cannot turn unto God by the simple powers of nature; and hence we cannot by our own natural strength do any good works, pleasing and acceptable in the sight of God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, and influencing us that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

IX. *Of the Justification of Man*.—We are never accounted righteous before God on account of our works or merits; but it is only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and by faith in his name, that we are justified. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and full of comfort.

X. *Of Good Works*.—Though good works are the fruits of faith, and follow justification, whilst they have not the virtue to put away our sins, nor to avert the judgment, or endure the severity of God's justice: yet they are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, if they spring out

of a true and living faith, insomuch, that by them living faith may be as evidently known, as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

XI. *Of Sin after Justification.*—Not every sin willingly committed after justification is, therefore, the sin against the Holy Ghost, which is unpardonable. They cannot all be precluded from repentance who fall in sin after justification, nor their acceptance straightway denied them. After we have received the Holy Ghost, it may so happen, that we may depart from grace, and fall into sin; and, we may even thus arise again by the grace of God and amend our lives. And, therefore, the doctrine of those is to be rejected, who say, they can no more fall into sin as long as they live here, or who deny the place of forgiveness to such as do truly repent.

XII. *Of the Church.*—The visible Church of Christ is the community of true believers, among whom the word of God is preached in its purity, and the means of grace are duly administered, according to Christ's own appointment in all those things, so far as they are requisite, and in conformity with the ordinances of Christ.

XIII. *Of speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People may understand.*—Public prayers in the church, and the ministering of baptism and of the Lord's Supper in a tongue not understood by the people, are matters plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive church.

XIV. *Of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*—Baptism and the Lord's Supper, ordained by Christ, are not only given pledges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but they are much more certain signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by which he works invisibly in us, quickens and also strengthens and confirms our faith in him.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper were not ordained by Christ that we should abuse them; but that we should duly use them. And in such only, as worthily receive the same, they produce a wholesome and effectual power; but such, as receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as Paul saith.

XV. *Of Baptism.*—Baptism is not merely a token of a Christian profession, whereby Christians are distinguished from others, and whereby they obligate themselves to observe every Christian duty; but it is also a sign of internal ablution, renovation, or the new birth.

XVI. *Of the Lord's Supper.*—The Supper of the Lord is not merely a token of love and union, that Christians ought to have among themselves and one towards another; but it is much more, a mystery or a representation of our redemption by the sufferings and death of Christ; insomuch, that such as rightly, and worthily, and faithfully receive the same, partake of the body and blood of Christ by faith, as the impart-

ing means, not in a bodily but in a spiritual manner, in eating the broken bread and in drinking the blessed cup, which is handed them. Transubstantiation, or the changing of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, cannot be supported by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of the Scriptures.

XVII. *Of the only Oblation of Christ, finished upon the Cross.*—The offering which was once made by Christ on the cross, is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, so that there is no other satisfaction required but that alone.

XVIII. *Of Church Rites and Ceremonies.*—It is by no means necessary, that ceremonies and rites should in all places be the same, or exactly alike; for they have always been different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times and national manners, provided, that nothing be introduced contrary to God's ordinances. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth break the ordinances, ceremonies and rites of the church to which he belongs, (if they are not repugnant to the word of God, and are ordained by proper authority,) ought to be rebuked openly, as one that offendeth against the order of the church, and woundeth the consciences of the weaker brethren, in order that others may be deterred from similar audacity.

Every particular church has the privilege to introduce, change and abolish rites and ceremonies; yet so, that all things may be done to edification.

XIX. *Of the Rulers of the United States of America.*—The President, Congress, the General Assemblies, the Governors, and the Councils of State, *as the delegates of the people*, according to the regulation and transfer of power, made to them by the constitution of the United States, and by the constitutions of their respective states, are the rulers of, and in the United States. And these states are a sovereign and independent nation, which is and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction: though we believe that wars and bloodshed are not agreeable with the gospel and spirit of Christ.

XX. *Concerning the Christian's temporal property.*—The temporal property of Christians must not be considered as common, in regard to the right, title and possession of the same, as some do vainly pretend; but as lawful possessions. Notwithstanding, every one ought, of the things he possesseth, to give to the poor and needy, and to manifest Christian love and liberality towards them.

XXI. *Of the last Judgment and God's righteous Sentence of Rewards and Punishments.*—We believe that Jesus Christ will come in the last

day, to judge all mankind by a righteous judgment; that God will give unto the faithful, elect and godly, eternal life and happiness, everlasting rest, peace and joy without end. But God will bid the impenitent and ungodly, depart to the devil and his angels, to endure everlasting damnation, punishment and pain, torment and misery. Therefore we are not to concede to the doctrine of those who maintain that devils and ungodly men will not have to suffer eternal punishment and torment.

CONFERENCES.

Their conferences are: first, a quarterly; second, an annual; and third, a general conference. The first takes place on every circuit at the quarterly meetings; the second once a year in every conference district, and the third every four years in the district of the whole society, on account of which it is called the general conference. The members of the quarterly conference are all the class-leaders, exhorters, travelling and local preachers, residing or stationed in the circuit of said quarterly conference. The members of the annual conferences are all the travelling preachers, and such as have travelled, and who by ordination stand in full connexion with the ministry. The general conference consists of delegates who are elected of every annual conference every fourth year, *one* for every four members of her own body. There is in addition to these another annual conference appointed for the local preachers on every circuit, where several of them reside; but these are destined principally for the investigation of the character and conduct of said preachers, in order to save time at the annual conferences of the travelling ministry.

Arrangement of the Society.—The whole society is divided into conference districts, the conference districts into smaller districts, these into circuits, and the circuits into classes.

FRIENDS OR QUAKERS.

BY THOMAS EVANS,
PHILADELPHIA.

THE religious Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, is a body of Christian professors, which arose in England about the middle of the seventeenth century. The ministry of George Fox was chiefly instrumental, under the divine blessing, in convincing those who joined him of those Christian principles and testimonies which distinguish the society; and his pious labours contributed in no small degree to their establishment as an organized body, having a regular form of church government and discipline.

This devoted servant of Christ was born at Drayton, in Leicestershire, in the year 1624, and was carefully educated by his parents in the Episcopal mode of worship. He appears to have led a religious life from his childhood, and to have been deeply concerned for the salvation of his soul. Amid a high profession of religion, then generally prevalent, he observed among the people much vain and trifling conversation and conduct, as well as sordid earthly-mindedness, both which he believed to be incompatible with the Christian life. This brought great trouble upon his mind, clearly perceiving that the profession in which he had been educated did not give to its adherents that victory over sin which the gospel enjoins, and which his soul panted after. He withdrew from his former associates, and passed much of his time in retirement,—reading the holy scriptures, and endeavouring to wait upon the Lord for the revelation of his Spirit, to enable him rightly to understand the truths of the gospel.

In this state of reverent dependence upon the Fountain of saving knowledge, his mind was enlightened to see into the spirituality of the gospel dispensation, and to detect many errors which had crept into the professing Christian church. In the year 1647, he commenced his labours as a minister of the gospel, travelling extensively through England, generally on foot; and, from a conviction that it was contrary to Christ's positive command, he refused to

receive any compensation for preaching, defraying his expenses out of his own slender means. The unction from on high, which attended his ministry, carried conviction to the hearts of many of his hearers; and his fervent disinterested labours were crowned with such success, that in a few years a large body of persons had embraced the Christian principles which he promulgated.

The civil and religious commotions which prevailed in England about this period, doubtless prepared the way for the more rapid spread of gospel truth. The fetters, in which priestcraft had long held the human mind, were beginning to be loosened; the dependence of man upon his fellow-man, in matters of religion, was shaken, and many sincere souls, panting after a nearer acquaintance with God, and a dominion over their sinful appetites and passions, which they could not obtain by the most scrupulous observance of the ceremonies of religion, were earnestly inquiring, "What must we do to be saved?" The message of George Fox appears to have been, mainly, to direct the people to Christ Jesus, the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, who died for them, and had sent his spirit or light into their hearts, to instruct and guide them in the things pertaining to life and salvation.

To the light of Christ Jesus, in the conscience, he endeavoured to turn the attention of all, as that by which sin was manifested and reproved, duty unfolded, and ability given to run with alacrity and joy in the way of God's commandments. The preaching of this doctrine was glad tidings of great joy to many longing souls, who eagerly embraced it, as that for which they had been seeking; and, as they walked in this divine light, they experienced a growth in grace and in Christian knowledge, and gradually came to be established as pillars in the house of God.

Many of these, before they joined with George Fox, had been highly esteemed in the various religious societies of the day, for their distinguished piety and experience, being punctual in the performance of all their religious duties, and regular in partaking of what are termed "the ordinances." But, notwithstanding they endeavoured to be faithful to the degree of knowledge they had received, their minds were not yet at rest. They did not witness that redemption from sin, and that establishment in the truth, which they read of in the Bible as the privilege and duty of Christians; and hence, they were induced to believe that there was a purer and more spiritual way than they had yet found. They felt that they needed to know more of the power of Christ Jesus in their own hearts, making them new creatures, bruising Satan, and putting him under their feet, and

renewing their souls up into the divine image which was lost in Adam's fall, and sanctifying them wholly, in body, soul and spirit, through the inward operations of the Holy Ghost and fire.

Great were their conflicts and earnest their prayers, that they might be brought to this blessed experience; but looking without, instead of having their attention turned within, they missed the object of their search. They frequented the preaching of the most eminent ministers; spent much time in reading the holy scriptures, in fasting, meditation and prayer, and increased the strictness of their lives and religious performances; but still they were not wholly freed from the dominion of sin.

Some, after wearying themselves with the multitude and severity of their duties, without finding the expected benefit from them, separated from all the forms of worship then practised, and sat down together, waiting upon the Lord, and earnestly looking and praying for the full manifestation of the kingdom and power of the Lord Jesus.

In this humble, seeking state, the Lord was graciously pleased to meet with them; sometimes without any instrumental means, at others, through the living ministry of George Fox or other anointed servants, who were prepared and sent forth to preach the gospel. Then they were brought to see that that, which made them uneasy in the midst of their high profession and manifold observances, and raised fervent breathings after the God of their lives, was nothing less than the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, striving with them in order to bring them out fully from under the bondage of sin, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

They were brought to see that they had been resting too much in a mere historical belief of the blessed doctrines of the gospel, the birth, life, miracles, sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension, mediation, intercession, atonement and divinity of the Lord Jesus; but had not sufficiently looked for, and abode under, the heart-changing and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit or Comforter; to seal those precious truths on the understanding, and give to each one a living and practical interest in them; so that they might really know Christ to be their Saviour and Redeemer, and that he had, indeed, come into their hearts and set up his righteous government there.

This was the dawning of a new day to their souls; and, as they attended in simple obedience to the discoveries of this divine light, they were gradually led to see farther into the spirituality of the gospel dispensation. The change which it made in their views was great, and many and deep were their searchings of heart, trying "the

fleece both wet and dry," ere they yielded; lest they should be mistaken and put the workings of their own imagination for the unfoldings of the Spirit of Christ; but as they patiently abode under its enlightening operations, every doubt and difficulty was removed, and they were enabled to speak from joyful experience of that which they had seen, and tasted, and handled of the good word of life.

The rapid spread of the doctrines preached by George Fox, was surprising; and, among those who embraced them, were persons of the best families in the kingdom; several priests of the Episcopal denomination and ministers of other societies; besides, many other learned and substantial men. A large number of ministers, both men and women, were soon raised up in the infant society, who travelled abroad, as they believed themselves divinely called, spreading the knowledge of the truth, and strengthening and comforting the newly convinced. In a few years meetings were settled in nearly all parts of the United Kingdom; and, notwithstanding the severe persecution to which the society was subjected, by which thousands were locked up in jails and dungeons, and deprived of nearly all their property, besides being subjected to barbarous personal abuse; its members continued to increase, and manifested a zeal and devotedness which excited the admiration even of their persecutors. Their sufferings seemed only to animate them with fresh ardour, and to unite them more closely together in the bond of gospel fellowship. Instances occurred where all the parents were thrown into prison, and the children continued to hold their meetings, unawed by the threats of the officers, or the cruel whippings which some of them suffered.

As early as the year 1655, some ministers travelled on the continent of Europe, and meetings of Friends were soon after settled in Holland and other places;—some travelled into Asia, some were carried to Africa; and several were imprisoned in the Inquisitions of Rome, Malta, and in Hungary. About the same period the first Friends arrived in America, at the port of Boston, and commenced their religious labours among the people, many of whom embraced the doctrines which they heard. The spirit of persecution, from which Friends had suffered so deeply in England, made its appearance in America with increased virulence and cruelty, inflicting upon the peaceable Quakers various punishments; and finally put four of them to death by the gallows.

Notwithstanding the opposition they had to encounter, the principles of Friends continued to spread in America; many eminent ministers, actuated by the love of the gospel and a sense of religious duty, came over and travelled through the country; others, removed

thither and settled ;—and in 1682, a large number, under the patronage of William Penn, came into the province of Pennsylvania, and founded that flourishing colony. At that time, meetings were settled along the Atlantic provinces, from North Carolina as far as Boston in New England ; and, at the present day, the largest body of Friends is to be found in the United States.

When we consider the great numbers who joined the society ; that, without any formal admission, all those who embraced the principles of Friends and attended their meetings were considered members, as well as their children, and of course, the body in some measure implicated in the consistency of their conduct ; the numerous meetings which were settled, and the wide extent of country which they embraced ; it is obvious that the organization of the society would have been imperfect, without some system of church government by which the conduct of the members might be inspected and restrained.

The enlightened and comprehensive mind of George Fox was not long in perceiving the necessity for this ; and he early began to make arrangements for carrying it into practice. Under the guidance of the light of Christ Jesus, which had so clearly unfolded to him the doctrines and precepts of the gospel in their true spiritual character, he commenced the arduous work of establishing meetings for discipline ; and, in a few years, had the satisfaction to see his labour and concern crowned with success, both in England and America. Under the influence of that Christian love which warmed his heart toward the whole human family, but which more especially flowed toward the household of faith, he was very tender of the poor, and careful to see that their necessities were duly supplied. This principle has ever since characterized the society, which cheerfully supports its own poor, besides contributing its share to the public burdens. The first objects to which the attention of these meetings was directed were the care of the poor and destitute, who had been reduced to want by persecution, or other causes ; the manner of accomplishing marriages ; the registry of births and deaths ; the education and apprenticing of children ; the granting of suitable certificates of unity and approbation to ministers who travelled abroad, and the preservation of an account of the sufferings sustained by Friends in support of their religious principles and testimonies.

It also became necessary to establish regulations for preserving the members in a line of conduct consistent with their profession. In this imperfect state of being, we are instructed from the highest authority, that offences must needs come ; but it does not necessarily follow, either that the offender must be cut off from the church, or that the reproach of his misconduct should be visited upon the society to

which he belongs. If in pursuance of those Christian means laid down in the gospel, he is brought to acknowledge and sincerely condemn his error, a brother is gained; the church is freed from reproach by his repentance and amendment of life; and thus the highest aim of all disciplinary regulations is attained. Where these effects, however, do not result from the Christian care of the church; it becomes its duty to testify against the disorderly conduct of the offender, and to declare that he has separated himself from its fellowship, and is no longer a member thereof. The views of George Fox on this subject were marked by that simplicity and scriptural soundness which distinguished his whole character.

He considered the church as a harmonious and compact body, made up of living members, having gifts differing according to the measure of grace received, yet all dependent one upon another, and each, even the weakest and lowest, having his proper place and service. As the very design of religious society is the preservation, comfort and edification of the members, and as all have a common interest in the promotion of these great ends; he considered every faithful member religiously bound to contribute according to his capacity toward their attainment. The words of our Lord furnish a short but comprehensive description of the order instituted by Him for the government of His church: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be to thee as an heathen man and a publican."

Here is no limitation of this Christian care to ministers or any other class; but any brother, who sees another offending, is to admonish him in love for his good. The language of our blessed Saviour respecting the authority of his church; and his being in the midst of it in the performance of its duties, is very clear and comprehensive: "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth, as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

The doctrine of the immediate presence of Christ with his church,

whether assembled for the purpose of divine worship, or for the transaction of its disciplinary affairs, is the foundation of all its authority. It was on this ground that George Fox so often exhorted his fellow-believers to hold their meetings in the power of the Lord; all waiting and striving to know Christ Jesus brought into dominion in their own hearts, and his Spirit leading and guiding them in their services, that so his living presence might be felt to preside over their assemblies. In a church thus gathered, we cannot doubt, that the gracious Head condescends to be in the midst, qualifying the members to worship the Father of spirits, in spirit and in truth, or enduing them with wisdom rightly to manage the business which may engage their attention. Nor can we question that so far as they are careful to act in his wisdom and under his direction, their conclusions, being in conformity with his will, have his authority for their sanction and support.

The discipline of the Society of Friends, established in conformity with these views, embraces four grades of meetings, connected with, and dependent upon, each other. First, the preparative meetings receive and prepare the business for the monthly meetings, which are composed of one or more preparative meetings, and rank next in order above them; in these the executive department of the discipline is chiefly lodged. The third grade includes quarterly meetings, which consist of several monthly meetings, and exercise a supervisory care over them, examine into their condition, and advise or assist them as occasion may require;—and lastly, the yearly meeting, which includes the whole, possesses exclusively the legislative power, and annually investigates the state of the whole body, which is brought before it by answers to queries, addressed to the subordinate meetings.

In each preparative meeting there are usually two or more Friends of each sex, appointed as overseers of the flock, whose duty it is to take cognizance of any improper conduct in the members, and endeavour by tender and affectionate labour to convince the offender, and bring him to such a sense of his fault as may lead to sincere repentance and amendment. Violations of the discipline by members are reported by the overseers to the preparative meetings; and from thence, if deemed necessary, to the monthly meeting, where a committee is usually appointed to endeavour to convince and reclaim the delinquent; and if this desirable result is not produced, a minute is made declaring the disunity of the meeting with his conduct and with him, until he is brought to a sense of his error, and condemns it in a satisfactory manner. From the decision of a monthly meeting, the disowned person has the right of appeal to the quarterly meeting,

and if that gives a judgment against him, he may carry his case to the yearly meeting also, where it is finally determined. The women have also overseers, appointed to extend Christian care and advice to their own sex; and likewise preparative, monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, in which they transact such business as relates to the good order and preservation of their members; but they take no part in the legislative proceedings of the society; and in difficult cases, or those of more than ordinary importance, they generally obtain the judgment of the men's meetings.

There are also distinct meetings for the care and help of the ministry, composed of ministers and elders, the latter being prudent and solid members, chosen specially to watch over the ministers for their good, and to admonish or advise them for their help. In these meetings the men and women meet together; they are called meetings of ministers and elders, and are divided into preparative, quarterly, and yearly.

There are at present in the society ten yearly meetings of Friends, viz. London and Dublin, in Great Britain and Ireland. New England, held at Newport, Rhode Island; New York, held in that city; Pennsylvania and New Jersey, held in Philadelphia; Maryland, held in Baltimore; Virginia, held in that state, at Cedar Creek and Summerton, alternately; North Carolina, held at New Garden in that state; Ohio, held at Mount Pleasant; and Indiana, held at Richmond in Wayne county. These include an aggregate of from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and fifty thousand members.

The doctrines of the society may be briefly stated as follows. They believe in one only wise, omnipotent, and everlasting God, the creator and upholder of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, the mediator between God and man; and in the Holy Spirit which proceedeth from the Father and the Son; one God blessed for ever. In expressing their views relative to the awful and mysterious doctrine of "the Three that bear record in heaven," they have carefully avoided the use of unscriptural terms, invented to define Him who is undefinable, and have scrupulously adhered to the safe and simple language of holy scripture, as contained in Matt. xxviii. 18-19, &c.

They own and believe in Jesus Christ, the beloved and only begotten Son of God, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. In him we have redemption, through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins; who is the express image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature, by whom all things were created that are in heaven or in earth, visible and invisible, whether

they be thrones, dominions, principalities or powers. They also believe that he was made a sacrifice for sin, who knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; that he was crucified for mankind, in the flesh, without the gates of Jerusalem; that he was buried and rose again the third day, by the power of the Father, for our justification, and that he ascended up into heaven, and now sitteth at the right hand of God, our holy mediator, advocate, and intercessor. They believe that he alone is the redeemer and saviour of man, the captain of salvation, who saves from sin as well as from hell and the wrath to come, and destroys the works of the devil. He is the Seed of the woman that bruises the serpent's head, even Christ Jesus, the Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. He is, as the scriptures of truth say of him, our wisdom, righteousness, justification, and redemption; neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we may be saved.

The Society of Friends have uniformly declared their belief in the divinity and manhood of the Lord Jesus: that he was both true God and perfect man, and that his sacrifice of himself upon the cross was a propitiation and atonement for the sins of the whole world, and that the remission of sins which any partake of, is only in, and by virtue of, that most satisfactory sacrifice, and no otherwise.

Friends believe also in the Holy Spirit, or comforter, the promise of the Father, whom Christ declared he would send in his name, to lead and guide his followers into all truth, to teach them all things, and to bring all things to their remembrance. A manifestation of this Spirit they believe is given to every man to profit withal; that it convicts for sin, and, as attended to, gives power to the soul to overcome and forsake it; it opens to the mind the mysteries of salvation, enables it savingly to understand the truths recorded in the holy scriptures, and gives it the living, practical, and heartfelt experience of those things which pertain to its everlasting welfare. They believe that the saving knowledge of God and Christ cannot be attained in any other way than by the revelation of this spirit;—for the apostle says, “What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things which are freely given to us of God.” If therefore the things which properly appertain to man cannot be discerned by any lower principle than the spirit of man: those things, which properly relate to God and Christ, cannot be known by any power inferior to that of the Holy Spirit.

They believe that man was created in the image of God, capable of understanding the divine law, and of holding communion with his Maker. Through transgression he fell from this blessed state, and lost the heavenly image. His posterity come into the world in the image of the earthly man; and, until renewed by the quickening and regenerating power of the heavenly man, Christ Jesus, manifested in the soul, they are fallen, degenerated, and dead to the divine life in which Adam originally stood, and are subject to the power, nature and seed of the serpent; and not only their words and deeds, but their imaginations, are evil perpetually in the sight of God. Man, therefore, in this state can know nothing aright concerning God; his thoughts and conceptions of spiritual things, until he is disjoined from this evil seed, and united to the divine light, Christ Jesus, are unprofitable to himself and to others.

But while it entertains these views of the lost and undone condition of man in the fall, the society does not believe that mankind are punishable for Adam's sin, or that we partake of his guilt, until we make it our own by transgression of the divine law.

But God, who out of his infinite love sent his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ into the world to taste death for every man, hath granted to all men, of whatever nation or country, a day or time of visitation, during which it is possible for them to partake of the benefits of Christ's death, and be saved. For this end he hath communicated to every man a measure of the light of his own Son, a measure of grace or the Holy Spirit—by which he invites, calls, exhorts, and strives with every man, in order to save him; which light or grace, as it is received and not resisted, works the salvation of all, even of those who are ignorant of Adam's fall, and of the death and sufferings of Christ; both by bringing them to a sense of their own misery, and to be sharers in the sufferings of Christ, inwardly; and by making them partakers of his resurrection, in becoming holy, pure and righteous, and recovered out of their sins. By which also are saved they that have the knowledge of Christ outwardly, in that it opens their understandings rightly to use and apply the things delivered in the scriptures, and to receive the saving use of them. But this Holy Spirit, or light of Christ, may be resisted and rejected; in which then, God is said to be resisted and pressed down, and Christ to be again crucified and put to open shame; and to those who thus resist and refuse him, he becomes their condemnation.

As many as resist not the light of Christ Jesus, but receive and walk therein, it becomes in them a holy, pure and spiritual birth, bringing forth holiness, righteousness and purity, and all those other

blessed fruits which are acceptable to God, by which holy birth, viz. Jesus Christ formed within us, and working his works in us, as we are sanctified, so we are justified in the sight of God; according to the apostle's words: "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Therefore, it is not by our works wrought in our will, nor yet by good works considered as of themselves, that we are justified, but *by Christ*, who is both the gift and the giver, and the cause producing the effects in us. As he hath reconciled us while we were enemies, so doth he also, in his wisdom, save and justify us after this manner; as saith the same apostle elsewhere: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ, our Saviour, that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." We renounce all natural power and ability in ourselves, to bring us out of our lost and fallen condition and first nature, and confess that as of ourselves we are able to do nothing that is good, so neither can we procure remission of sins or justification by any act of our own, so as to merit it, or to draw it as a debt from God due to us; but we acknowledge all to be of and from his love, which is the original and fundamental cause of our acceptance. God manifested his love toward us, in the sending of his beloved son, the Lord Jesus Christ, into the world, who gave himself an offering for us and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour; and having made peace through the blood of the cross, that he might reconcile us unto himself, and by the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot unto God, he suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God.

In a word, if justification be considered in its full and just latitude, neither Christ's work without us, in the prepared body, nor his work within us, by his Holy Spirit, is to be excluded; for both have their place and service in our complete justification. By the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ without us, we, truly repenting and believing, are, through the mercy of God, justified from the imputation of sins and transgressions that are past, as though they had never been committed; and by the mighty work of Christ within us, the power, nature and habits of sin are destroyed; that, as sin once reigned unto death, even so now grace reigneth, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord. All this is effected, not by a bare or naked act of faith, separate from obedience, but in the

obedience of faith; Christ being the author of eternal salvation to none but those that obey him.

The Society of Friends believes that there will be a resurrection both of the righteous and the wicked; the one to eternal life and blessedness, and the other to everlasting misery and torment; agreeably to Matt. xxv. 31-46, John v. 25-30, 1 Cor. xv. 12-58. That God will judge the world by that Man whom he hath ordained, even Christ Jesus the Lord, who will render unto every man according to his works; to them, who by patient continuing in well-doing during this life seek for glory and honour, immortality and eternal life; but unto the contentious and disobedient, who obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that sinneth, for God is no respecter of persons.

The religious Society of Friends has always believed that the holy scriptures were written by divine inspiration, and contain a declaration of all the fundamental doctrines and principles relating to eternal life and salvation, and that whatsoever doctrine or practice is contrary to them, is to be rejected as false and erroneous; that they are a declaration of the mind and will of God, in and to the several ages in which they were written, and are obligatory on us, and are to be read, believed and fulfilled by the assistance of divine grace. Though it does not call them "the Word of God," believing that epithet peculiarly applicable to the Lord Jesus; yet it believes them to be the words of God, written by holy men as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; that they were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope; and that they are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. It looks upon them as the only fit outward judge and test of controversies among Christians, and is very willing that all its doctrines and practices should be tried by them, freely admitting that whatsoever any do, pretending to the spirit, which is contrary to the scriptures, be condemned as a delusion of the devil.

As there is one Lord and one faith, so there is but one baptism, of which the water baptism of John was a figure. The baptism which belongs to the gospel, the Society of Friends believes, is "not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." This answer of a good conscience can only be produced by the purifying operation of the Holy Spirit, transforming and renewing the heart, and bringing the will into conformity to the divine will. The distinction between Christ's baptism and that of water is clearly pointed

out by John: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire, whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

In conformity with this declaration, the society holds that the baptism which now saves is inward and spiritual; that true Christians are "baptized by one Spirit into one body;" that "as many as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ;" and that "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away, behold all things are become new, and all things of God."

Respecting the communion of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Society of Friends believes, that it is inward and spiritual—a real participation of his divine nature through faith in him, and obedience to the power of the Holy Ghost, by which the soul is enabled daily to feed upon the flesh and blood of our crucified and risen Lord, and is thus nourished and strengthened. Of this spiritual communion, the breaking of bread and drinking of wine by our Saviour with his disciples was figurative; the true Christian supper being that set forth in the Revelations: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him and will sup with him, and he with me."

As the Lord Jesus declared, "Without me, ye can do nothing," the Society of Friends holds the doctrine that man can do nothing that tends to the glory of God and his own salvation without the immediate assistance of the Spirit of Christ; and that this aid is especially necessary in the performance of the highest act of which he is capable, even the worship of the Almighty. This worship must be in spirit and in truth; an intercourse between the soul and its great Creator, which is not dependent upon, or necessarily connected with, any thing which one man can do for another. It is the practice therefore of the society to sit down in solemn silence to worship God; that each one may be engaged to gather inward to the gift of divine grace, in order to experience ability reverently to wait upon the Father of spirits, and to offer unto him through Christ Jesus our holy Mediator, a sacrifice well pleasing in his sight, whether it be, in silent mental adoration, the secret breathing of the soul unto him, the public ministry of the gospel, or vocal prayer or thanksgiving. Those, who are thus gathered, are the true worshippers, "who worship God in the spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."

In relation to the ministry of the gospel, the society holds that the authority and qualification for this important work are the special gift of Christ Jesus, the great Head of the church, bestowed both upon men and women, without distinction of rank, talent, or learning; and must be received immediately from him, through the revelation of his spirit in the heart; agreeably to the declarations of the apostle: "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the purifying of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ"—"to one is given by the Spirit, the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, by the same Spirit; to another faith; to another the gifts of healing—to another the working of miracles,—to another prophecy—to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues;—but all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ."

Viewing the command of our Saviour, "Freely ye have received, freely give," as of lasting obligation upon all his ministers, the society has, from the first, steadfastly maintained the doctrine that the gospel is to be preached without money and without price, and has borne a constant and faithful testimony, through much suffering, against a man-made hireling ministry, which derives its qualification and authority from human learning and ordination; which does not recognise a direct divine call to this solemn work, or acknowledge its dependence, for the performance of it, upon the renewed motions and assistance of the Holy Spirit. Where a minister believes himself called to religious service abroad, the expense of accomplishing which is beyond his means, if his brethren unite with his engaging in it and set him at liberty therefor, the meeting he belongs to is required to see that the service be not hindered for want of pecuniary means.

The Society of Friends believes that war is wholly at variance with the spirit of the gospel, which continually breathes peace on earth and good-will to men. That, as the reign of the Prince of peace comes to be set up in the hearts of men, nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. They receive, in their full and literal signification, the plain and positive commands of Christ: "I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also,"—"I say unto you, love your enemies; bless them

that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." They consider these to be binding on every Christian, and that the observance of them would eradicate from the human heart those malevolent passions in which strife and warfare originate.

In the same manner, the society believes itself bound by the express command of our Lord: "Swear not at all," and that of the apostle James: "But above all things, my brethren, swear not; neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea be yea and your nay nay, lest ye fall into condemnation;" and therefore, its members refuse, for conscience' sake, either to administer or to take an oath.

Consistently with its belief in the purity and spirituality of the gospel, the society cannot conscientiously unite in the observance of public fasts, and feasts, and holy days, set up in the will of man. It believes that the fast we are called to, is not bowing the head as a bulrush for a day, and abstaining from meats or drinks; but a continued fasting from every thing of a sinful nature, which would unfit the soul for being the temple of the Holy Ghost. It holds that under the gospel dispensation there is no inherent holiness in any one day above another, but that every day is to be kept alike holy; by denying ourselves, taking up our cross daily and following Christ. Hence it cannot pay a superstitious reverence to the first day of the week; but inasmuch as it is necessary that some time should be set apart to meet together to wait upon God, and as it is fit that at some times we should be freed from other outward affairs, and as it is reasonable and just that servants and beasts should have some time allowed them for rest from their labour; and as it appears that the apostles and primitive Christians used the first day of the week for these purposes: the society, therefore, observes this day as a season of cessation from all unnecessary labour, and for religious retirement and waiting upon God; yet not so as to prevent them from meeting on other days of the week for divine worship.

The society has long borne a testimony against the crying sin of enslaving the human species, as entirely at variance with the commands of our Saviour, and the spirit of the Christian religion; and likewise against the unnecessary use of intoxicating liquors.

Friends believe magistracy or civil government to be God's ordinance, the good ends thereof being for the punishment of evil-doers, and the praise of them that do well. While they feel themselves restrained by the pacific principles of the gospel from joining in any warlike measures

to pull down, set up, or defend any particular government: they consider it a duty to live peaceably under whatever form of government it shall please Divine Providence to permit to be set up over them; to obey the laws so far as they do not violate their consciences; and, where an active compliance would infringe on their religious scruples, to endure patiently the penalties imposed upon them. The society discourages its members from accepting posts or offices in civil government which expose them to the danger of violating our Christian testimonies against war, oaths, &c., and also from engaging in political strife and party heats and disputes, believing that the work to which we are particularly called, is to labour for the spread of the peaceful reign of the Messiah.

It also forbids its members to go to law with each other; enjoining them to settle their disputes, if any arise, through the arbitration of their brethren; and if peculiar circumstances, such as the cases of executors, trustees, &c., render this course impracticable or unsafe, and liberty is obtained to bring the matter into court, that they should on such occasions, as well as in suits with other persons, conduct themselves with moderation and forbearance, without anger or animosity; and in their whole demeanour evince that they are under the government of a divine principle, and that nothing but the necessity of the case brings them there.

In conformity with the precepts and examples of the apostles and primitive believers, the society enjoins upon its members a simple and unostentatious mode of living, free from needless care and expense; moderation in the pursuit of business; and that they discountenance music, dancing, stage plays, horse races, and all other vain and unprofitable amusements; as well as the changeable fashions and manners of the world, in dress, language, or the furniture of their houses; that, daily living in the fear of God and under the power of the cross of Christ, which crucifies to the world and all its lusts, they may show forth a conduct and conversation becoming their Christian profession, and adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.

In the year 1827, a portion of the members in some of the American yearly meetings, seceded from the society, and set up a distinct and independent association, but still holding to the name of Friends. The document issued by the first meeting they held, bearing date the 21st of 4th month 1827, and stating the causes of their secession, says, "Doctrines held by one part of society, and which we believe to be sound and edifying, are pronounced by the other part to be unsound and spurious." The doctrines, here alluded to, were certain opinions promulgated by Elias Hicks, denying or invalidating the

miraculous conception, divinity and atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also the authenticity and divine authority of the holy scriptures. These, with some other notions, were so entirely repugnant to the acknowledged and settled principles of the society, that endeavours were used to prevent the promulgation of them. The friends and admirers of Elias Hicks and his principles were dissatisfied with this opposition to their views; and after some years of fruitless effort to get the control of the meetings of Friends, they finally withdrew and set up meetings of their own. In this secession some members in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Ohio and Indiana yearly meetings, and a few in New England went off from the society. In the others; viz. London, Dublin, Virginia and North Carolina, no separation took place. This new society, (commonly known by the appellation of Hicksites, after the name of its founder,) being still in existence, claiming the title of Friends, and making a similar appearance in dress and language, some notice of the separation seemed necessary, in order to prevent confusion.

•

FRIENDS.

BY WILLIAM GIBBONS, M.D.,

WILMINGTON, DELAWARE.

NOTE.—In the following sketch, I have given what I believe to be the doctrines of that portion of the Society of Friends of which I am a member. No doubt there are different *opinions* among them, as there were among primitive Friends, on some subjects not reducible to practice, or in regard to which we cannot appeal to experience, and which, in reference to scripture, may be differently understood. I alone am responsible for what I have written—the society having no written creed.

WILLIAM GIBBONS.

Wilmington, Del., 7th month, 1843.

ORIGIN OF THE SOCIETY.

The Society of Friends originated in England about the middle of the 17th century. The chief instrument in the divine hand for the gathering and establishment of this religious body was George Fox. He was born in the year 1624. He was carefully educated according to the received views of religion, and in conformity with the established mode of worship. His natural endowments of mind, although they derived but little advantage from the aid of art, were evidently of a very superior order. The character of this extraordinary man it will not, however, be necessary here to describe with critical minuteness. The reader, who may be desirous of acquiring more exact information on this head, is referred to the journal of his life, an interesting piece of autobiography, written in a simple and unembellished style, and containing a plain and unstudied narration of facts. By this it appears, that in very early life he indulged a vein of thoughtfulness and a deep tone of religious feeling, which, increasing with his years, were the means of preserving him, in a remarkable degree, free from the contamination of evil example

by which he was surrounded. The period in which he lived was distinguished by a spirit of anxious inquiry, and a great appearance of zeal, on the subject of religion. The manners of the age were nevertheless deeply tinctured with licentiousness, which pervaded all classes of society, not excepting professors of religion. Under these circumstances, George Fox soon became dissatisfied with the mode of worship in which he had been educated. Withdrawing, therefore, from the public communion, he devoted himself to retirement, to inward meditation, and the study of the scriptures. While thus engaged in an earnest pursuit of divine knowledge, his mind became gradually enlightened to discover the nature of true religion; that it consisted not in outward profession, nor in external forms and ceremonies, but in purity of heart, and an upright walking before God. He was instructed to comprehend, that the means by which those necessary characteristics of true devotion were to be acquired were not of a secondary or remote nature; that the Supreme Being still condescended, as in former days, to communicate his will immediately to the soul of man, through the medium of his own Holy Spirit; and that obedience to the dictates of this inward and heavenly monitor constituted the basis of true piety, and the only certain ground of divine favour and acceptance. The convictions, thus produced in his own mind, he did not hesitate openly to avow. In defiance of clerical weight and influence, he denounced all human usurpation and interference in matters of religion, and boldly proclaimed that "God was come to teach his people himself." The novelty of his views attracted general attention, and exposed him to much obloquy; but his honesty and uprightness won him the esteem and approbation of the more candid and discerning. Persevering, through every obstacle, in a faithful testimony to the simplicity of the truth, he found many persons who, entertaining kindred impressions with himself, were fully prepared not only to adopt his views, but publicly to advocate them. The violent persecution which they encountered, served only to invigorate their zeal and multiply the number of their converts. United on a common ground of inward conviction, endeared still more to each other by a participation of suffering, and aware of the benefits to be derived from systematic co-operation: George Fox and his friends soon became embodied in an independent religious community.

Such is a brief history of the rise of the people called *Quakers*: to which I will only add, that the society continued to increase rapidly till near the end of the seventeenth century, through a most cruel and widely-extended persecution. Between the years 1650

and 1689, about *fourteen thousand* of this people suffered by fine and imprisonment, of which number more than three hundred died in jail; not to mention cruel mockings, buffetings, scourgings, and afflictions innumerable. All these things they bore with exemplary patience and fortitude, not returning evil for evil, but breathing the prayer, in the expressive language of conduct, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" The testimonies for which they principally suffered, were those against a hireling priesthood, tithes and oaths; against doing homage to man with "cap and knee;" and against using flattering titles and compliments, and the plural number to a single person.

I am next to speak of their religious principles, which are found embodied in their *testimonies*.

DOCTRINES OF THE SOCIETY.

The Society of Friends has never formed a creed after the manner of other religious denominations. We view Christianity essentially as a practical and not a theoretical system; and hence to be exemplified and recognised in the lives and conduct of its professors. We also hold that belief, in this connexion, does not consist in a mere assent of the natural understanding, but in a clear conviction wrought by the Divine Spirit in the soul. (1 John v. 10.) For that which here challenges our belief involves a knowledge of God; and no man knoweth the things of God but by the Spirit of God. (1 Cor. ii. 11.) Again, religion is a progressive work: "There is first the blade, then the ear, and after that the full corn in the ear." (Mark iv. 28.) "And some there are who have need of milk, and not of strong meat; and every one that useth milk is unskilful in the work of righteousness: for he is a babe." (Heb. v. 12, 13.)

Seeing, therefore, that there are different growths and degrees of knowledge in the members of the body, we cannot but view the practice of requiring them to subscribe to the same creed, or articles of faith, as a pernicious excrescence ingrafted on the Christian system. And hence we prefer judging of our members by their fruits, and leaving them to be taught in the school of Christ, under the tuition of an infallible teacher, free from the shackles imposed by the wisdom or contrivance of man.

Our testimony to the light of Christ within.—We believe a knowledge of the gospel to be founded on *immediate* revelation. (Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11, 12; John xiv. 26.) Being the antitype of the legal dispensation, it is spiritual as its author, and as the soul which

it purifies and redeems. (Rom. i. 16.) Under the gospel dispensation, the temple, (1 Cor. v. 19; Acts vii. 48,) altar, (Heb. xiii. 10,) sacrifices, (1 Pet. ii. 5,) the flesh and blood, (John vi. 53-63,) water and fire, (John vii. 37, 38; iv. 14; Matt. iii. 11,) cleansing and worship, (John iv. 23, 24,) are all spiritual.* Instituted by the second Adam, the gospel restores to us the privileges and blessings enjoyed by the first; the same pure, spiritual worship, the same union and communion with our Maker. (John xvii. 21.) Such are our views of the Christian religion; a religion freely offered to the whole human race, (Heb. viii. 10, 11,) requiring neither priest nor book to administer or to illustrate it, (1 John ii. 27; Rom. x. 6, 7, 8); for all outward rites and ceremonies are, to this religion, but clogs or cumbrous appendages, God himself being its author, its voucher, and its teacher. (John xiv. 26; 1 Cor. ii. 9-12.) These are not speculations or notions, for we speak of what we do know, "and our hands have handled of the word of life." (1 John i. 1.)

Such is a summary of the religion held and taught by the primitive "Quakers;" from which I descend to a few particulars, as a further exposition of their and our principles.

The message which they received is the same given to the apostles, that "God is light, and in him there is no darkness at all," (1 John i. 6, 7): and their great fundamental principle to which they bear testimony is, that God hath given to every man coming into the world, and placed within him, a measure or manifestation of this divine light, grace, or spirit which, if obeyed, is all-sufficient to redeem or save him. (John iii. 19, 20; i. 9; Tit. ii. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 7.) It is referred to and illustrated in the scriptures, by the prophets, and by Jesus Christ and his disciples and apostles, under various names and similitudes. But the thing we believe to be one, even as God is one and his purpose one and the same in all, viz. repentance, regeneration, and final redemption. It is called *light*—of which the light of the natural sun is a beautiful and instructive emblem; for this divine light, like the natural, enables us to distinguish with indubitable clearness all that concerns us in the works of salvation, and its blessings are as impartially, freely, and universally dispensed to the spiritual, as the other is to the outward creation. It is called *grace*, and *grace of God*, because freely bestowed on us by his bounty and enduring love. (John xiv. 16, 26.)

It is called *truth*, as being the substance of all types and shadows,

* Vid. Christian Quaker, Phila. edition, 1824, p. 52. I. Pennington, vol. i. p. 360; vol. ii. pp. 115, 116, 281, 282. Whitehead's *Light and Life of Christ*, pp. 48, 49.

and imparting to man a true sense and view of his condition, as it is in the divine sight. It is called Christ (Rom. viii. 10; x. 6, 7, 8); Christ within, the hope of glory (Col. i. 27); the kingdom of God within (Luke xvii. 21); the word of God (Heb. iv. 12, 13); a manifestation of the Spirit, given to every man to profit withal (1 Cor. xii. 7); the seed (Luke viii. 11); a still small voice (1 Kings xix. 12); because most certainly heard in a state of retirement, but drowned by the excitement of the passions, the roivings of the imagination, and the eager pursuit of worldly objects. "And thine ear shall hear a word behind thee saying, This is the way, walk ye in it—when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left."

It is compared to a "grain of mustard seed, the smallest of all seeds," being at first little in its appearance; but, as it is obeyed, growing and extending like that plant, until it occupies the whole ground of the heart, and thus expands into and sets up the kingdom of God in the soul. (Luke xiii. 19.) For the like reason it is compared to "a little leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal,* until the whole was leavened," or brought into its own nature. (Luke xiii. 21.)

This unspeakable gift, through the infinite wisdom and goodness of the divine economy, speaks to every man's condition, supplies all his spiritual need, and is a present and all-sufficient help in every emergency and trial. To the obedient it proves a "comforter," under temptation a "monitor," and a "swift witness" against the transgressor. It is a "quickeningspirit" to rouse the indifferent; "like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap, purifying the unclean;" and as a "hammer" to the heart of the obdurate sinner; and in all, an infallible teacher, and guide to virtue and holiness.†

And as there are diversities of operations and administrations, so also there are diversities of gifts bestowed on the members of the body (1 Cor. xii. 4–12): "The Spirit dividing to every man severally as he will," in order that every office and service in the church militant may be performed, to preserve its health, strength, and purity. And thus by one and the "self same spirit," "we are all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and all are made to drink into one spirit." (1 Cor. xii. 13.)

* A measure was two and a half gallons; the quantity of meal was, therefore, nearly one bushel.

† For a further exposition of this fundamental principle of the Society of Friends, the reader is referred to the following works: Barclay, pp. 78, 81, 82; George Fox, "Great Mystery," pp. 140, 142, 188, 217, 245; Christian Quaker, Phila. edition, 1824, pp. 198, 200; *Ib.* pp. 5 to 55; George Fox's Journal, *passim*; Stephen Crisp's Sermon at Grace Church Street, May 24, 1688.

Divine internal light is often confounded with conscience, and thus inferences are drawn against the truth of the doctrine. But this principle is as distinct from that natural faculty, as the light of the sun is distinct from the eye on which it operates. From a wrong education, and from habitual transgression, the judgment becomes perverted or darkened, and often "calls evil good and good evil;" and conscience being swayed by the judgment responds to its decisions, and accuses or excuses accordingly. In this manner conscience becomes corrupted and defiled. Now it is our belief that, if the discoveries made and monitions given by divine light, to the mind, were strictly attended to; it would correct and reform the erring conscience and judgment, and dissipate the darkness in which the mind becomes involved.

Such is our testimony to the *'great fundamental principle* in religion, as we believe and understand it. We exclude speculative opinions. If the reader be dissatisfied with our impersonal form of expression, let him change it and it will be a change of name only. We dispute not about names.

We believe in the divinity of Christ—not of the outward body, but of the spirit which dwelt in it—a divinity not self-existing and independent, but derived from the Father, being the Holy Spirit, or God in Christ. "The Son can do nothing of himself," said Christ; and again, "I can of mine own self do nothing" (John v. 19, 30); and in another place, "The Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the work" (John xiv. 10); "As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things" (John viii. 28); "Even as the Father said unto me, so I speak," (John xii. 50.)*

We reject the common doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Satisfaction*, as contrary to reason and revelation, and for a more full expression of our views on these subjects, we refer the inquiring reader to the works below cited.† We are equally far from owning the doctrine of "imputed righteousness," in the manner and form in which it is held. We believe there must be a true righteousness of heart and life, wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, or Christ within; in which

* See also John iii. 34; v. 26, 36; vi. 38, 57; vii. 16; viii. 28, 42; xii. 49; I. Pennington, vol. iii. pp. 61, 62, 236; Whitehead's *Light and Life of Christ*, p. 35; Thomas Zachary, p. 6; Wm. Penn, vol. ii. pp. 65, 66; Edward Burrough, p. 637; Wm. Baily, pp. 157, 158; Stephen Crisp, pp. 75, 76.

† Wm. Penn's "Sandy Foundation Shaken," passim; I. Pennington, vol. ii. pp. 115, 116, 427; vol. iii. pp. 32, 34, 54, 61, 62, 135, 226, 236; Job Scott's "Salvation by Christ," pp. 16, 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, 35; Christian Quaker, pp. 34, 135, 199, 262, 276, 350, 354, 369, 405; Wm. Penn's Works, fol. ed. vol. ii. pp. 65, 66, 420, 421; vol. v. p. 385; Wm. Baily, pp. 157, 158; T. Story's Journal, p. 385; Fox's Doctrinals, pp. 644, 646, 664, 1035.

work we impute all to him, for of ourselves we can do nothing. Neither do we admit that the sins of Adam are, in any sense, imputed to his posterity; but we believe that no one incurs the guilt of sin, until he transgresses the law of God in his own person. (Deut. i. 39; Ezek. xvii. 10-24; Matt. xxi. 16; Mark x. 14, 15, 16; Rom. ix. 11.) In that fallen state, the love and mercy of God are ever extended for his regeneration and redemption. God so loved the world, that he sent his only begotten Son into the world, in that prepared body, under the former dispensation, for the salvation of men. And it is through the same redeeming love, and for the same purpose that, under the "new covenant," he now sends the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, a mediator and intercessor, to reconcile us, and render us obedient to the holy will and righteous law of God. We believe that all, that is to be savingly known of God, is made manifest or revealed in man by his Spirit (Rom. i. 19); and if mankind had been satisfied to rest here, and had practised on the knowledge thus communicated, there would never have existed a controversy about religion, and no materials could now have been found for the work, of which this essay forms a part. (Deut. xxviii. 15, 29.)

Our testimony concerning the Scriptures.—We believe that the scriptures have proceeded from the revelations of the Spirit of God to the saints; and this belief is founded on evidence furnished by the same Spirit to our minds. We experience them to be profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. But as they are a declaration from the fountain only, and not the fountain itself, they bear the same inscription as the sun-dial: "*Non sine lumine*"—useless, or a dead letter, without light;* because the right interpretation, authority and certainty of them, and, consequently, their usefulness, depend on the assurance and evidence of the same Spirit by which they were dictated, given to the mind of the reader. (2 Cor. iii. 6.) For, although we believe that we may be helped and strengthened by outward means, such as the scriptures, and an authorized gospel ministry: yet it is only by the Spirit that we can come to the true knowledge of God, and be led "into all truth." Under these several considerations, we cannot accept these writings as the foundation and ground of all religious knowledge, nor as the primary rule of faith and practice; since these high attributes belong to the divine Spirit alone, by which the scriptures themselves are tested. Neither do we confound cause and effect by styling them the "Word of God," which title belongs to Christ alone, the

* Phipp's "Original and Present State of Man."

fountain from which they proceeded. (Eph. vi. 17; Heb. iv. 12; Rev. xix. 13.)

Our testimony on Divine Worship, the Ministry, &c.—We believe that they, that worship the Father aright, must worship him in spirit and in truth, and not in a formal manner. (John iv. 24.) Hence, when we meet together for public worship, we do not hasten into outward performances. (1 Pet. iv. 11.) For, as we believe that of ourselves, and by our own natural reason, we can perform no act that will be acceptable to God, or available to our own advancement in righteousness, without the sensible influence of his good Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 3): much less can we, without this divine aid, be useful to others, or minister at set times, seeing that this essential requisite is not at our command. Therefore it is our practice, when thus met together, to sit in silence, and withdraw our minds from outward things, to wait upon God, and “feel after him, if haply we may find him.” (Psalm xli. 10.) And in these silent opportunities we are often strengthened and refreshed together by his heavenly presence. (Matt. xviii. 20.) This manner of worship we believe to be more acceptable to our great Head, “who seeth in secret,” than set forms of prayer or praise, however specious, performed in the will of man. (1 Cor. ii. 13; Luke xii. 12.) Yet we do not exclude the use of a rightly qualified ministry, but believe it to be a great blessing to the church. Nor do we exclude vocal prayer, when properly authorized; though we bear testimony against the custom of appointing times and persons for this solemn service by human authority; believing that without the immediate operation of the divine power, “we know not what we should pray for as we ought.” (Rom. viii. 26.)

I have before stated it as our belief, that outward rites and ceremonies have no place under the Christian dispensation, which we regard as a purely spiritual administration. Hence we hold that the means of initiation into the church of Christ does not consist in the water-baptism of John, which *decreasing* rite has vanished (John iii. 30); but in Christ’s baptism, (Matt. iii. 11,) or that of the Holy Spirit; the fruits of which are repentance and the new birth. Neither do we believe that *spiritual* communion can be maintained between Christ and his church, by the use of the outward “elements” of bread and wine, called the “supper,” which is the type or shadow only; but that the true communion is that alluded to in the Revelations: “Behold I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.”

A hireling ministry, or the practice of taking money for preach-

ing, we testify against, as contrary to the plain precept and command of Christ, "Freely ye have received, freely give." Further, we hold that to constitute a minister of Christ requires a special gift, call, and qualification from the blessed Master, and that neither scholastic divinity, philosophy, nor the forms of ordination, confer in any degree either ability or authority to engage in this service of Christ, (1 Cor. ii. 4, 5, 13,) who has forewarned us that without him we can do nothing for ourselves. (John xv. 5.) As we believe that gifts in the ministry are bestowed by the Head of the Church, so we presume not to limit him in the dispensation of them, to any condition of life, or to one sex alone; seeing that male and female are all one in Christ. And this liberty we look upon as a fulfilment of prophecy, having received abundant evidence of its salutary influence in the church. (Acts ii. 16, 17; xxi. 9.)

Our testimonies against war, slavery, and oaths, are generally well known, and have their rise in the convictions of the spirit of truth in our minds, amply confirmed by the precepts and commands of Christ and his apostles, to which we refer the reader.

We condemn frivolous and vain amusements, and changeable fashions and superfluities in dress and furniture, shows of rejoicing and mourning, and public diversions. They are a waste of that time given us for nobler purposes, and are incompatible with the simplicity, gravity, and dignity that should adorn the Christian character.

We refrain from the use of the plural number to a single person, and of compliments in our intercourse with men, as having their origin in flattery, and tending to nourish a principle, the antagonist of that humility and meekness, which, after the example of Christ, ought to attach to his disciples. We also decline giving the common names to the months and days, which have been bestowed on them in honour of the heroes and false gods of antiquity, thus originating from superstition and idolatry.

We inculcate submission to the laws in all cases where the "rights of conscience" are not thereby violated. But as Christ's kingdom is not of this world, we hold that the civil power is limited to the maintenance of external peace and good order, and therefore has no right whatever to interfere in religious matters.

OF THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

The purposes of our discipline are, the relief of the poor, the maintenance of good order, the support of our testimonies, and the help and recovery of such as are overtaken in faults.

In the practice of discipline, we think it indispensable that the order recommended by Christ himself be invariably observed: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church." (Matt. xviii. 15, 16, 17.)

To effect the salutary purposes of discipline, meetings were appointed at an early period of the society, which, from the times of their being held, were called *quarterly* meetings. It was afterwards found expedient to divide the districts of those meetings, and to meet more frequently; whence arose *monthly* meetings, subordinate to those held quarterly. At length in 1669, a *yearly* meeting was established, to be held in London, to superintend, assist, and provide rules for the whole. Previously to this time, *general* meetings had been held occasionally.

A monthly meeting is usually composed of several particular congregations, situated at convenient distances from each other. These are called preparative meetings; because they prepare business for the monthly meetings. It is the business of the monthly meeting to provide for the subsistence of the poor, and for the education of their offspring; to judge of the sincerity and fitness of persons appearing to be convinced of the religious principles of the society, and desiring to be admitted into membership; to excite due attention to the discharge of religious and moral duty; and to deal with disorderly members. Monthly meetings also grant to such of their members, as remove into other monthly meetings, certificates of their membership and conduct, without which they cannot gain membership in such meetings; and they grant certificates to ministers concerned to visit neighbouring meetings in the service of the gospel, setting forth that their concern has been laid before their own meeting and approved of. Each monthly meeting is required to appoint certain persons, under the name of overseers, who are to take care that the rules of our discipline be put in practice; and, when any case of delinquency comes to their knowledge, to visit the offending member, agreeably

to the gospel rule before mentioned, previously to its being laid before the monthly meeting.

When a case is introduced, a committee is appointed to visit the offender, to endeavour to convince him of his error, and to induce him to condemn or forsake it. If this be done to the satisfaction of the meeting, a record is made accordingly, and the case is dismissed. If not, he is disowned from membership.

In disputes between individuals, it has long been the decided judgment of the society, that its members should not sue each other at law. It therefore enjoins on all to end their differences by speedy and impartial arbitration, agreeably to rules laid down in the discipline. If any refuse to adopt this mode, or having adopted it, if they refuse to submit to the award, they are liable to disownment.

To monthly meetings also belongs the allowing of marriages; for our society has always scrupled to acknowledge the authority of priests, or hiring ministers, in the solemnization of this rite. Those, who intend to marry, inform the monthly meeting of their intentions, when a committee is appointed both from the men's and women's meeting, to make inquiry if the parties are clear from other similar engagements; and if found to be so, the consent of parents or guardians being shown, the marriage is allowed by the meeting. It is performed in a public meeting for worship, or in a meeting held at the house of one of the parties, towards the close of which they stand up, and solemnly take each other for husband and wife. The certificate is then signed, read, and attested. A committee appointed by the monthly meeting attends the marriage to see that it be orderly accomplished, moderation observed, and to deliver the certificate to the recorder. Of such marriages the meeting keeps a record, and also of the births and burials of its members.

Births and burials are unaccompanied with rites and ceremonies. At burials a solemn pause is made, and an opportunity afforded for those who may be concerned, to communicate their exercises.

Several monthly meetings compose a quarterly meeting. At the quarterly meeting are produced written answers from the monthly meetings to certain queries respecting the conduct of their members, and the meeting's care over them. The following are the principal subjects thus regularly brought into view by the queries: Attendance of all the meetings, with punctuality; clearness from disorderly conduct therein; prevalence of love and unity; absence of tale-bearing and detraction; speedy endeavours to heal differences; careful education of children; their frequent reading of the scriptures; their restraint from reading pernicious books and from corrupting intercourse; ab-

sence of traffic in ardent spirits, and of the use of them as a drink; avoiding places of diversion, and the frequenting of taverns; observance of temperance in other respects; providing for poor members, and schooling their children; faithful support of testimony against oaths, an hireling ministry, war, fraudulent or clandestine trade, dealing in prize-goods and lotteries; care to live within their circumstances, and to keep to moderation in trade; punctuality to promises, and just payment of debts; timely attention to such as give ground for uneasiness in these respects; dealing with offenders in the proper spirit and without delay, for their help, and when necessary to disown, seeking right authority; support of schools under the care of the meeting. At the close of the answers to the queries, certain advices are read in the preparative and monthly meetings, in the conclusion of which Friends are enjoined to conduct the affairs of their meetings in "the peaceable spirit and wisdom of Jesus, with decency, forbearance and love of each other."

A summary of the answers to the queries is made out in the quarterly meeting, and forwarded to the yearly meeting, thus setting forth the general state of society. Appeals of disowned persons, from the judgment of the monthly meetings, are brought to the quarterly meetings for revision. It is also the business of these meetings to assist in any difficult cases that may be presented by the monthly meetings, or where remissness appears in the care of these bodies over their members.

The yearly meeting has the general superintendence of the society within the limits embraced by the several quarterly meetings of which it is composed; and therefore, as the accounts which it receives discover the state of inferior meetings, as particular exigencies require, or as the meeting is impressed with a sense of duty, it gives forth its advice, makes such regulations as appear to be requisite, or excites to the observance of those already made, and sometimes appoints committees to visit those quarterly and monthly meetings which appear to be in need of immediate advice. Each yearly meeting forms its own discipline. Appeals of disowned members from the judgment of quarterly meetings are here finally determined. A brotherly correspondence, by epistles, is maintained with other yearly meetings.

As we believe that women may be rightly called to the work of the ministry, we also think that to them belongs a share in the support of our discipline; and that some parts of it, wherein their own sex is concerned, devolve on them with peculiar propriety. Accordingly, they have monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings of their own, held

at the same time with those of the men, but separately, and without the power of making rules.

In order that ministers may have the tender sympathy and counsel of those, who by their experience in religion, are qualified for that service, the monthly meetings are advised to select such, from both sexes, under the denomination of elders. These, together with the approved ministers, have meetings peculiar to themselves, called "meetings of ministers and elders;" in which they have an opportunity of exciting each other to the discharge of their respective duties, and of extending advice to those who may appear to need it, without needless exposure. Such meetings are generally held within the compass of each monthly, quarterly, and yearly meeting. They are conducted by rules prescribed by the yearly meeting, and have no authority to make any alterations of, or additions to the discipline. The members of the select meeting, as it is often called, unite with their brethren in the meetings for discipline, and are equally amenable to the latter for their conduct.

Those who believe themselves required to speak in meetings for worship, are not immediately acknowledged as ministers by their monthly meetings; but time is taken for judgment, that the meeting may be satisfied of their call and qualification. It also sometimes happens that such, as are not approved, obtrude themselves as ministers, to the grief of their brethren. But much forbearance is used towards these, before the disapprobation of the meeting is publicly expressed.

In order that the yearly meeting may be properly represented during its recess, there is a body called the Meeting for Sufferings, or Representative Committee, composed of a certain number of members appointed by each quarterly meeting. It is the business of this meeting to receive and record the account of sufferings from refusal to pay fines and other military demands, sent up annually from the quarterly meetings; to distribute useful religious books; to advise or assist our members who may incline to publish any manuscript or work tending to promote the cause of truth, or the benefit of society; and in general to act on behalf of the yearly meeting in any case where the welfare of the body may render it needful. It keeps a record of its proceedings, which is annually laid before the yearly meeting. Except this meeting and the meeting of ministers and elders, all our members have a right to attend the meetings of business, and to take part in the proceedings; and they are encouraged to do so. We have no chairman or moderator, and the duty of the clerks is limited to recording the proceedings. We decide no ques-

tion by vote, but by what appears to be the sense of the meeting. In matters which elicit a difference of sentiment, personal and censorious remarks are discouraged, and care is taken to exercise a spirit of condescension and brotherly love. Thus it often occurs in our meetings, that deference to the views and feelings of a few consistent members will prevent the body from adopting a measure in which there is otherwise great unanimity.

The Yearly Meetings of New York, Genessee, Baltimore, Ohio, and Indiana, hold an epistolary correspondence with Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, according to ancient practice. But the Yearly Meeting of London has declined this intercourse since the separation in 1827.

GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

BY LEWIS MAYER, D. D.,

YORK, PA.

THE German Reformed Church, as its name imports, comprises that portion of the family of reformed churches who speak the German language and their descendants, and as such is distinguished from the French Reformed, the Dutch Reformed, &c. It embraces the reformed churches of Germany and of the German part of Switzerland, and their brethren and descendants in other countries, particularly in the United States of America.

The founder of this church was ULRIC ZWINGLI, a native of Switzerland. He was born on the 1st day of January, 1484, at Wildhaus, a village of the ancient county of Tokkenburg, then a dependency of the Benedictine Abbey of St. Gall, under the guardianship of the canton of Schweiz, but, since 1803, included in the new canton of St. Gall.

About the time of Zwingli's birth, the people of Tokkenburg had effected their emancipation from the condition of serfs to the saintly abbey, and now breathed the air of freedom in all its delightful freshness; and the future reformer, inhaling the same enlivening air from his infancy, and growing up to manhood under its influence, became the champion of liberty, in all the forms in which the human mind is by nature free.

Possessing talents of a high order, and cultivated by the best education which the times could afford, and a lofty genius could attain; taught, at the same time, by the Spirit of God, and guided by him into a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus: Zwingli rose upon the world a burning and shining light, and showed to bewildered men, groping in the darkness of a long night, the way to God, whose mercy they sought, and the path to heaven, for which they sighed. Dark clouds often intercepted the light; but its beams burst forth again in their wonted brightness; the truth prevailed, superstition gave way, and the church arose in her strength, the fetters falling from her

hands, and occupied the place which God had assigned her as the bride of his Son, and the parent of true piety and virtue.

The first principle of the German Reformed Church is contained in the proposition: "The Bible is above all human authority, and to it alone must every appeal be made." This principle Zwingli first announced in 1516, when he was yet pastor of the Church of Glarus; from it he went forth in all his subsequent investigations of religious truth, and in all his public instructions; and when he reformed the church, after his establishment in Zurich, he swept away from her ritual, as well as from her doctrinal system, all that the Bible did not authorize, either by an express warrant or by an implied one. The interpretation of the Bible he left, where God had left it, to the judgment and the conscience of every man who can apprehend the meaning of words, and compare one passage with another; and if the truth could not be ascertained in this way, he felt assured that neither the fathers, nor the Pope, nor a general council, could be trusted as interpreters of the sacred oracles; for these, he knew, had no better way.

The Reformed Church differed, at first, from the Lutheran in nothing but the single point only of the Lord's Supper. In the conference at Marburg in 1529, which had been procured by the Landgrave of Hesse for the purpose of healing the breach between the Saxon and the Swiss divines, and where Zwingli and Oecolampadius disputed with Melancthon and Luther, this was the only point on which they did not agree. Neither did they differ concerning the whole subject of the eucharist, but concerning only the import of the words, "This is my body," "This is my blood." Zwingli took them as a trope, and understood them to mean that the bread was a sign or figure of the Lord's body, and the wine of his blood. Luther insisted on a literal meaning, and contended that these words were the irrefragable testimony of the Lord himself, that his material body and blood were really present in and with the bread and wine, and were received, together with them, by the communicant; and to fix this notion, he maintained that, like the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ were received, not by faith, but by the mouth; not by the believer only, but by every communicant.

The Reformed regarded this difference as unessential, and acknowledged their opponents as brethren in Christ, whom it was their duty to receive. Luther classed it with the essentials of Christianity, and would not admit that those who denied the real presence were Christians at all. Zwingli proffered his hand to Luther and besought him with tears to receive him as a Christian brother, saying that there

were no people in the world with whom he would delight more to have fraternal communion than those of Wittemberg. Luther spurned his hand and turned away. In her subsequent history, the Reformed Church often sought the same fraternity, and made some concessions for that object; but she was as often repelled; and her anxiety for a reunion subjected her to the epithet of Gern-Brüder, *i. e.* Would-be-brethren.

The doctrine of predestination, which at a later period became a prominent subject of controversy between the two churches, was held by all the reformers, unless Haller, the reformer of Berne, and Bullinger, Zwingli's successor in Zurich, be exceptions. Luther contended for it, in its rigid Augustinian form, in his tract *De Servo Arbitrio*. Melancthon also maintained it in the earlier editions of his *Loci Communes Theologici*, a system of divinity which long continued to be the text-book of theological students in the Lutheran church. Controversy on this subject between theologians of the two churches first arose in 1561, when Zanchius and Marbach, two divines of Strasburg, took opposite sides; and such was still the prevailing sentiment of that period, that this strife could be composed by submitting to the contending parties, as the terms of peace, an ambiguous form of words, which each might interpret as he pleased. Long after this time, Melancthon's theory of *synergism*, or co-operation of the human will with divine grace in the sinner's conversion, was condemned as heresy in the Lutheran Church; and in the synergistic controversy between the Philipists, or followers of Melancthon, and the rigid Lutherans, while the former ascribed to the human will a power to co-operate with the Holy Spirit in the act of conversion, the latter not only denied this power, but maintained in all its rigour the Augustinian doctrine of absolute predestination. (See Plank's *Gesch. der Protestantischen Theologie*, Bd. III. p. 805, &c.)

A third cause of difference, which became, at a later period, a subject of controversy between the two churches, was the use of certain religious rites and institutions which to the Reformed appeared to favour superstition, while the Lutherans regarded them all as tolerable, and some of them as useful. Such were the use of images in the churches, the distinguishing vestments of the clergy, private confession of sins and absolution, the use of the wafer in the Lord's Supper, lay-baptism, exorcism of the evil spirit previous to baptism, altars, baptismal fonts, &c. Most of these usages have been laid aside, and are now unknown in the Lutheran Church in this country. Little now remains to distinguish the two churches; they recognise each other

as brethren, worship together, and abhor the controversy that would rupture the bond of mutual love.

After the death of Zwingli and Ecolampadius, in 1531, none of their associates enjoyed so decided a superiority over his brethren, as to give him a commanding influence over the whole church, and to secure to him the chief direction of her councils. This honour was reserved for John Calvin, the French reformer. He was born at Noyon, in France, in the year 1509. Driven from his own country by persecution, he came to Basel in 1534. Here, in the following year, he published the first edition of his "Institutes of the Christian Religion;" a work which became the text-book of theology in the Reformed Church, and which he enlarged and improved in successive editions, until the year 1559. On his return from a visit to the Duchess of Ferrara, in Italy, who was friendly to the Reformation, being compelled by the war to take the route through Geneva, he came to that city in August 1536, and was persuaded by Farell and Viret to remain there, and complete the reformation which they had begun. A violent opposition from the licentious part of the inhabitants, who hated the strictness of his moral discipline, resulted in his expulsion in 1538. He repaired to Strasburg, where he taught theology, and preached to a French congregation; but in 1541 he was recalled to Geneva, and appointed professor of theology and principal pastor of the city. He was now enabled to prosecute successfully, though not without frequent and often malicious opposition, the plan of reformation which he had formed. Endowed with great natural talents, richly furnished with stores of theological learning, fired by an ardent zeal for what he conceived to be truth, and possessed of a spirit of diligence that never tired, he rose in power and reputation above all his cotemporaries, and caused his influence to be felt wherever the Reformation was known, or became known. His design was vast and bold, like his genius: not content with reforming the little state which had received him as her spiritual father, he meditated the extension of the same work far beyond her narrow bounds, and sought to make Geneva the nursery and the model of all the Reformed churches throughout the world. Neither was he wholly disappointed. The splendour of his name, and the fame of his associate and successor, Theodore Beza, who maintained his entire system, attracted to Geneva the studious youth who looked to the Christian ministry, from all the countries upon which the light of the Reformation had risen; the university over which they presided cast into the shade the University of Basel and the Seminary of

Zurich, and reigned long almost without a competitor; and Geneva became thus the nursing-mother from whom the whole church received her pastors and derived her spiritual instruction, and the model after which, in more than one country, her ecclesiastical constitution was formed.

The influence of the school of Calvin was felt by the German as well as by the other Reformed churches. The preachers who came from Geneva brought with them the doctrine and the spirit of the new reformer, and diffused them through the churches over which they presided; and Calvinism thus became every where triumphant. Out of Switzerland, Zwingli, silent in death that came, alas! too soon, was by degrees neglected and forgotten; and even in his own country his spirit was checked and his doctrine modified by this foreign influence.

Calvin differed from Zwingli chiefly on three points, viz., on the Lord's Supper, on church-government, and on religious liberty.

On the first point of difference Calvin took a position that was less offensive to the Papists than the doctrine of Zwingli, and presented to the Lutherans a middle ground upon which they might unite with the Reformed. Zwingli had taught, that to eat the flesh of Christ and to drink his blood, was simply to believe in him, and thereby to obtain pardon and eternal life. Calvin, on the contrary, maintained a real participation of the material body and blood of Christ, of which he considered the partaking of the bread and wine the visible sign and seal. He distinguished between believing in Christ and partaking of his flesh and blood, and made the latter consequent upon the former. This participation of Christ's body and blood, he viewed as necessary to spiritual and eternal life. It is confined to the believer, and is effected, he thought, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, who elevates the believer, by means of his faith, to Christ, in heaven, and makes him, in a mysterious manner, a participant of the Lord's body and blood; and we thus become united with Christ, so that we are flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, and constitute one body with him, which is governed by one and the same spirit. He differed from Luther in separating Christ from the bread and wine, and denying the presence of his body and blood in or with those elements. A consequence of this was, that a communicant might receive the elements without receiving the body and blood of Christ; and this, he held, was the case of all who were destitute of true faith. (See Calvin's *Institutes*, Book IV. chap. xvii.)

Zwingli, seeing the abuse of church-power in the Roman hierarchy, and finding no authority for it in the holy scriptures, subjected the

church to the civil authority, in a Christian state, in all things relating to its government, which are not at variance with the divine word. Calvin separated the church wholly from the state, claimed for it the power of self-government, and left to secular rulers nothing more than the duty of protection and sustenance, as nursing fathers and nursing mothers.

Zwingli taught the doctrine of absolute predestination as well as Calvin and the other reformers,* but he did not impose it as an article of faith upon his church. Opposite opinions were, therefore, freely entertained; and even his successor, Henry Bullinger, is claimed as an asserter of the universality of divine grace. In the canton of Bern, particularly, controversy on this subject ran high. "The preachers and professors at Lausanne, who were friends of Calvin," says Schröck, "demanded a general synod, and authority to excommunicate, that they might suppress the opinions which they opposed; but the Senate of Bern rejected this ecclesiastical tyranny, as Haller called it."—(See Schröck's *Kirch. Gesch. seit der Ref.*, vol. v. p. 179.) Calvin did not tolerate the theories on this subject to which his own was opposed.

Such, however, was the credit of Calvin, and such his perseverance, that he succeeded in 1549, notwithstanding the reluctance of the Swiss, to procure the formal reception of his doctrine on the Lord's Supper, in Switzerland, and a few years later, to obtain for his doctrine of predestination a recognition as an article of faith, in the same country. But, with all his credit, he could not persuade the Swiss to accept his form of church government. The rulers were not willing to relinquish to the church the power which they possessed; and the Reformed Cantons still retain that ecclesiastical polity which they received from the hands of Zwingli.

In Germany, as well as in Switzerland, the supreme authority in the church resides in the civil government. The immediate administration of church power is vested in a consistory or ecclesiastical council, (*kirchenrath*), which is a mixed body of clergy and statesmen. The clergy of a given district constitute a chapter or classis, and at the head of each of these bodies is an inspector or superintendent, whose office is somewhat similar to that of a bishop in Episcopal churches.† Several chapters or classes compose a synod, and two or more particular synods may form a general synod; which may

* Dr. Mosheim errs in asserting the contrary, as the reader will perceive who will take the pains to examine this reformer's writings. See the extracts from his works published by Vögelin and Usteri, vol. i. part i. chap. v. p. 187, &c.

† In Switzerland the chapter has at its head the decanus or dean.

either consist of delegates from the lower judicatories, or embrace all the clergy of the Reformed Church in the same country, or in several contiguous countries. In Switzerland, the clergy of the two cantons of Zurich and Thurgau, and of the Rhinethal, now included in the canton of St. Gall, constitute one synod, at the head of which is the pastor *primarius* of the Great-Minster in Zurich, who bears the title of Antistes. The Reformed Churches of Germany have elders and deacons, who are chosen for limited periods. The elders constitute a presbytery, who, in conjunction with the pastor, administer the spiritual government of the congregation. The deacons are charged with the temporal affairs, particularly with the care of the poor; but where the number of elders is small, the deacons take part with them in the spiritual administration. The inspectors exercise a supervision over the clergy, the congregations and the schools of their respective districts, and report to the consistory, whose decision is final, if not arrested by the act of the supreme civil authority. In some countries, as in the principality of Nassau, whose ecclesiastical constitution was taken from that of Holland, classes and synods have legislative authority. In others, as in the county of Lippe, their meetings are held only for their own improvement in Christian knowledge and piety. In the Reformed German part of Switzerland, the congregations are without elders and deacons. What are there called deacons are preachers who assist the principal pastor in the larger churches. The absence of the presbytery or body of elders, is compensated for by the *Kirchen-Stillstände*, a sort of sub-consistories, whose duty it is to watch over the morals of the church members, and to correct abuses in the conduct of life. The ecclesiastical assemblies of this country are composed of the clergy only. The same is the case in Germany, except in those countries, as in the principality of Nassau, whose church polity is derived from Holland or Geneva.

Admission to the privilege of full communion in the church is obtained by the rite of confirmation, which is preceded by a course of instruction in Christian doctrine. The catechumens solemnly devote themselves to the service of God by a public profession in the presence of the congregation, and are thereupon received by the imposition of hands and prayer. In the case of unbaptized adults, baptism immediately precedes the imposition of hands. The use of this rite rests upon expediency, no divine authority is claimed for it; still less is it viewed by the Reformed Church, as it is by the Church of Rome, in the light of a sacrament.

The doctrinal system of the German Reformed Church is contained in the Heidelberg Catechism—so called from Heidelberg, the capital

of the Electoral Palatinate, where it was first published, in the reign of the Elector Frederick III., in the year 1563. It was adopted, as a symbolical book, soon after its publication, by almost all the Reformed Churches in Europe, and became particularly the symbolical book of the Reformed in Germany. This formulary observes a singular moderation on some points upon which the several parties in the Protestant churches differed, or respecting which good men might entertain different opinions. The wise elector selected for the composition of this work two men, of whom one, Zacharias Ursinus, was a disciple of Melancthon; and the other, Caspar Olevianus, a disciple of Calvin; and he being, himself, a Philipist, controlled their deliberations. The result was what all moderate men desired, a compromise. The catechism, in its general character, is Calvinistic; but the doctrine of election is placed in the background, and presented in a form which the Philipist as well as the Calvinist could easily receive. On the Lord's Supper it unites the theories of Zwingli and of Calvin, with the latter of whom Melancthon was essentially agreed. It is silent about the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, but leaves an open door for the introduction of that theory. The atonement is made general where it says that Christ bore the wrath of God against the sins of all mankind; but nothing is said to forbid a limitation of it to the elect in its actual effect. It asserts the total inability of the unregenerate to do any good until he is regenerated by the Spirit of God; but it leaves room for the Philipist to say, that when the Holy Spirit would regenerate us, the human will may resist or assent to his operation. If it were objected, that assenting before regeneration would be a good work, he might reply that it was not in the proper sense good; or that it was not completed before regeneration was complete; and this answer was sufficient for the object contemplated, if it satisfied himself.

Though the theory of Calvin on the Lord's Supper was generally received in the church, that of Zwingli always had many friends; it has been many years gaining ground, and, if we be not greatly mistaken, is now predominant, at least in the United States.

The doctrine of absolute predestination to eternal life has never been fully established as an article of faith in the German Reformed Church. In different sections of the church it has from time to time been variously modified, and in some wholly rejected. Though constituted an article of faith in Switzerland, by the consensus of 1554, recognised as such in the Helvetic Confession of 1566, and confirmed by the Synod of Dort in 1618-19: it was, nevertheless, so far supplanted by the opposing theories in 1675, that a necessity was deemed

to exist for a new Formula Consensus of the Swiss divines to sustain it. Nor did this new Confession maintain its authority very long; after many conflicts it fell before the influence of the French and the German schools about the year 1722, when subscription to it ceased to be required. (See Schröck's *Kirch. Gesch.* vol. viii. p. 661, &c.)

In Germany the decrees of the Synod of Dort were never received in some of the states, as Brandenburg, Anhalt, and Bremen; in others they have long since lost their binding authority; and the German Reformed Church is now, in relation to the doctrine of absolute election, where Zwingli left it. Calvinism is again reviving in the church, both in Europe and America; but the doctrine of Melancthon, or, what is essentially the same, the doctrine of Arminius, on this point, is predominant, and the theory of absolute predestination is generally regarded, by the laity at least, with horror.

The German Reformed Church in the United States was founded by emigrants from Germany and Switzerland. Her origin may be dated about the year 1740, or rather somewhat earlier. The principal seat of the church in her infancy was eastern Pennsylvania; though settlements were made also, and congregations formed, at an early period, in other states, particularly in the Carolinas, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, and New York. Her doctrinal system is derived from Germany and Switzerland; but her ecclesiastical polity is formed after the model of the Reformed Dutch Church of Holland, by whom she was nurtured and protected in her infant state, and to whom she owes a large debt of gratitude.

The Heidelberg Catechism is the only symbolical book of the church in the United States, though both in Germany and Switzerland she has others besides; and, in the first named country, adopts also the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, as altered by Melancthon, in the tenth article, relating to the Lord's Supper, in the later editions that were published under his direction.

Subscription to the catechism, by candidates for the ministry, is not required at their ordination; a verbal profession of the doctrine of the church being deemed sufficient. A professor of theology is required, at his ordination, to affirm to the following declaration:

"You, N. N., professor elect of the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church in the United States, acknowledge sincerely, before God and this assembly, that the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which are called the canonical scriptures, are genuine, authentic, inspired, and therefore divine scriptures; that they contain all things that relate to the faith, the practice, and the hope of the righteous, and are the only rule of faith and practice in

the church of God; that, consequently, no traditions, as they are called, and no mere conclusions of reason, that are contrary to the clear testimony of these scriptures, can be received as rules of faith or of life. You acknowledge, farther, that the doctrine contained in the Heidelberg Catechism, as to its substance, is the doctrine of the holy scriptures, and must, therefore, be received as divinely revealed truth. You declare sincerely that, in the office you are about to assume, you will make the inviolable divine authority of the holy scriptures, and the truth of the doctrine contained in the Heidelberg Catechism, as to its substance, the basis of all your instructions. You declare, finally, that you will labour according to the ability which God may grant you, that, with the divine blessing, the students entrusted to your care may become enlightened, pious, faithful, and zealous ministers of the gospel, who shall be sound in the faith."

The government of the church is Presbyterian. All ordained ministers are equal in rank and authority. Licentiates are not pastors, or ministers, but candidates for the ministry; they cannot administer the sacraments, nor be delegates to synod, and have no vote in the classical assemblies.

Each congregation is governed by its consistory or vestry, which is usually composed of elders and deacons, and of which the pastor of the church may, or may not, be a member. In chartered congregations the consistory is a legal corporation, with which the charter often joins others, besides elders and deacons, as counsellors, or trustees; and all these usually vote by custom, and by authority of the charter, on every question that comes before the body.

The clergy residing within certain bounds constitute a classis, which must consist of at least three ministers. A classis meets steadily once a year, and may resolve, or be called by its president, to hold a special meeting, as often as urgent business may demand it. The president is elected annually, and presides in the meeting of classis, for the maintenance of order, as *primus inter pares*. Every pastoral charge is entitled to a lay delegate, who must be an elder, and has the same right to deliberate and vote in the classis as the clerical member. A majority of the whole number, of which at least one half must be ministers, constitute a quorum; and every question is decided by a majority of those actually assembled.

The synod is composed of the clerical and lay delegates appointed by the classes. It meets steadily once a year, and may assemble in special meetings by its own appointment, or by the call of its president. The president of synod is in like manner elected annually. A classis consisting of not more than six ministers, is entitled to one

minister and one lay delegate to represent it in synod. A classis having more than six, and not more than twelve ministers, may be represented by two ministers and two lay delegates; and in the same ratio increasing for any larger number. Six ministers and six elders, from a majority of the classes, may constitute a quorum, as the constitution now provides.

A general convention of all the ministers and lay delegates of the whole church can be authorized by an act of synod, and not otherwise.

An appeal can be taken from the consistory to the classis, and from the classis to the synod, whose decision is final.

The German Reformed Church in this country is now spread over the whole of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and over portions of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and New York. There is a church in the city of New Orleans; others formerly subsisted in New Jersey, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky; and some members are still scattered over the several states of the Union.

This church is divided into two bodies, which maintain a friendly correspondence, but are wholly independent of one another. Each is governed by a synod and its lower judicatories.

The eastern portion of the church is the original and parent body; and its synod, existing before the other, bears the title of "The Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States." Its territory extends in Pennsylvania westward to the Alleghany mountains; northward it includes portions of New York; and on the south, Maryland, Virginia and Carolina. It has under its jurisdiction ten classes, viz: Philadelphia, Goshenhoppen, East Pennsylvania, Lebanon, Susquehanna, Zion, Mercersburg, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. The number of ministers and licentiates, in connexion with this synod, was, in 1842, agreeably to the statistical report of that year, one hundred and forty-one. Of this number thirty-two were without a pastoral charge; and of these, sixteen were disqualified by age or other causes; eight were engaged in the service of the church as teachers, editors, or agents; and eight were expectants, or otherwise employed. The number of congregations reported, was four hundred and sixty-six. From six pastoral stations the number was not reported. The whole may be estimated at five hundred.

This synod has under its care, or patronage, a theological seminary, founded in 1825; a grammar school, commenced in 1832; and a college, established in 1836. All these institutions are now located permanently at Mercersburg, a pleasant village, in Franklin county,

Pennsylvania, and are in a flourishing state under able professors and teachers. Two spacious edifices have been erected for the seminary and grammar school, the former of which is occupied also by the students of college. Measures are in progress for the erection of a suitable college edifice. The site chosen for it, as well as the situations of the other buildings, is picturesque and salubrious. The college bears the name of Marshall College, as a mark of respect for the memory of the late John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is governed by a board of trustees, a majority of whom are ministers or members of the German Reformed Church.

Subordinate to this synod are a board of foreign missions, a board of domestic missions, and a board of education, which is also the board of visitors of the theological seminary; but these institutions are yet in their infancy.

The Board of Foreign Missions, which is of quite recent origin, has under its care but one mission, with a single station, and one missionary family. The mission is at Broosa, in Asia Minor, the same which was lately under the care of the Newcastle Presbytery in the Presbyterian Church. The missionary family are the Rev. Benjamin Schneider and his wife. The business of foreign missions is transacted through the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, with whom a connexion for that object has been formed.

The Board of Domestic Missions have hitherto done but little in their appropriate office; but they have created a printing establishment, which is rendering very important service to their church. In addition to other printing, they publish two religious newspapers: the "Weekly Messenger of the German Reformed Church," a weekly paper of large size, in the English language, of which about 3000 copies are issued every week; and the "Christliche Zeitschrift," a semi-monthly in the German language, of which upwards of 1700 copies are issued every fortnight. The establishment is located at Chambersburg, Franklin county, Pennsylvania, where a convenient edifice has been purchased for its accommodation. It is under the immediate control of the executive committee of the board, whose locality is in the same place.

The Board of Education are charged with the care of beneficiary students, who are in a course of preparation for the gospel ministry in the church. They have under their patronage about thirty beneficiaries.

The western part of the church is located principally in Ohio and Pennsylvania, but extends also into the adjoining states, and has for

its field the entire valley of the Mississippi. About the year 1810 or 1812, the Rev. Jacob William Dechaut was sent by the synod as a missionary to the State of Ohio, and located himself at Miamisburg, in Montgomery county. He was followed by the Rev. Thomas Winters, George Weis, and others, who were willing to cultivate that long neglected soil. Prior to their settlement there was in all that region only one German Reformed minister, the Rev. I. Larose, who was not then in connexion with any ecclesiastical judicatory. In 1819 the Classis of Ohio was formed, and in 1823 or 1824, the majority of the classis separated from the parent body, and formed themselves into an independent judicatory, under the title of "The Synod of Ohio." In 1836 the Classis of Western Pennsylvania, obtained permission to unite with the Synod of Ohio, which now bore the title of "The Synod of Ohio and the adjoining States;" and by a late act this synod, which had previously been subdivided into three district synods, received a new organization agreeably to the plan of the constitution of the eastern church. The western church is now divided into classes, and its synod is a delegated body composed of the representatives of the classes.

The statistical tables of 1842, published as an appendix to the minutes of the eastern church of the same year, states the number of German Reformed ministers in the west to be fifty-one. The congregations reported were in number two hundred and fourteen. Nine pastoral stations had made no report. If these stations average four congregations each, the whole number will be two hundred and fifty. Some of the ministers preach to from eight to twelve congregations; only two limit their labours each to one; and only five others do not exceed three.

This synod has long contemplated the establishment of a theological seminary in the west. An institution of this kind was actually commenced some years ago; but after a very brief experiment it failed. It will, however, doubtless be revived at no distant day. The western church needs an institution nearer home than Mercersburg, and will feel the want of it more and more, as her numbers increase and her borders are enlarged. It will be impossible, without it, to keep pace, in the supply of ministers, with the rapid increase of population in the west; and it will be equally impossible, without a thorough education of her ministers, to maintain the dignity of the pulpit in her communion, amidst the growth of knowledge and refinement in the community.

THE JEWS AND THEIR RELIGION.

BY THE REV. ISAAC LEESER,

PASTOR OF THE HEBREW PORTUGUESE CONGREGATION, PHILADELPHIA.

WHEN we endeavour to trace the origin of the civilization which rules with its benignant sway the mightiest nations of modern times, and none more so than the people inhabiting the United States of America, we shall soon discover that it must be ascribed to a great *moral* influence which had its birth in the gray ages of antiquity. For, disguise it as you will, seek with candour or prejudice, you must at length arrive at the conclusion, that the sources whence the modern rules of moral government are in the main drawn, is the same which refreshed the Chaldean shepherd when he first felt moved to peril his all in the cause of that truth which his high-reaching intellect had discovered; that is to say, the truth of the existence of ONE Supreme, who created all and sustains in his mercy all that his power has called into being.—This source of light we call divine revelation, and it is contained for us, who live at this day, in the pages of that priceless book which we call the BIBLE.

Long indeed, however, had this Bible, this source of truth, to struggle against the furious assaults of pagan superstition; long even after the establishment of Christianity was the leaven of ancient usages too powerful for the simple truths of the Word of God; but with all this, triumph is gradually perching upon the banners of divinely illuminated reason; and with the certain, though slow, progress of mankind in the path of science and enlightenment, it is not to be doubted that pure religion will also become more and more the rule of life for the sons of man. There may be, and in truth are, many retrogressions; we find indeed that from some unforeseen causes, such as luxury, devastating wars, the irruption of barbarous nations, mankind have appeared, and to this day do appear, to deteriorate in certain periods; but upon the whole every age becomes wiser than its predecessor through the light of experience and by a knowledge of the evils which others had to endure. The storms

through which civilization has periodically to pass, purify it from the stagnant air which entire repose would necessarily create around it; for it has to share the fate with every other gift which has been bestowed upon mankind, of being endangered if it is not constantly watched, and guarded against the enemies which have been wisely placed around our happiness, that we may not fall into inaction and effeminacy.

The Jews, and their predecessors the Israelites, have been always regarded with suspicion, and not rarely with aversion, by those who hold opinions different from them; but if an inquirer were to look with the eye of truth into the source of this suspicion and of this aversion, he would be disappointed, for the honour of mankind, to find that both are without sufficient ground to warrant their being indulged in by any person who can lay the least claim to intelligence. One would suppose that the Judæophobia must be owing to some monstrous doctrines which the Jewish religion contains, which would render its professors dangerous to the state as unsafe citizens or rebellious subjects, by teaching them to imbrue their hands in blood, or to plunder the unwary of their possessions. Perhaps calumny has asserted these things; perhaps ignorance may have imagined that this could be so. But how stands the case?

In the days when the wealth of many nations was not estimated by the gold and silver in their houses, and by the ships which bore their products upon the face of the ocean, but by the multitude of their herds and flocks and of "the ships of the desert" the patient and burdensome camels, and the toilsome asses, and the number of their household: there arose a man in his beginning as simple as his countrymen, as unostentatious as any shepherd of them all. He was called Abraham; and lived in that fruitful country once known as Chaldæa. Around him every one seemed to have forgotten the existence of ONE Creator; for gross idolatry, or the worship as gods of things which have no power to save, was the prevailing vice of mankind. It is well to inquire, whether notions of right and wrong based upon such premises can be of real utility to man? whether a belief in gods full of human vices, according to the ideas even of their worshippers, can inspire the virtues which are the basis of true civilization? The candid reasoner will answer in the negative; for debasing conceptions of worship will naturally debase the understanding, and one is but too apt to excuse in himself what he discovers or fancies to exist in the being to whom he looks up with respect and adoration. This being premised, it will be readily conceded that at the appearance of Abraham the pervading popular

opinions were unfriendly to the advancement of civilization; and that therefore his promulgating contrary views, granting that he did so, was no evidence of his being an enemy to the general welfare. Let us then see, what did Abraham do? Disgusted with the follies surrounding him on all sides, convinced that the works of human hands were not proper objects of worship: he resolved in his heart to look from the creature to the Cause, and thus he brought himself to adore the Creator; since there is every where apparent the same principle as the foundation and origin of all that exists. Full of this sublime thought he left his native land, his father's roof, and wandered to the smiling country of the South, where the most horrible superstition had established itself in the shape of human sacrifices to the devouring Moloch. It was here he proclaimed the "God who is the living God and everlasting King," and exhibited in his conduct that neighbourly love, that regard for justice and righteousness, which compelled even the followers of a senseless system, if system it may be called, to look upon him who had come among them a stranger, who had made publicly known his attachment to a worship which they knew not, as "a prince of God in the midst of them." What now were the principles of Abraham? Simply these: first, the belief in the existence of one God, who made heaven and earth; secondly, obedience to the dictates of this God; thirdly, accountability to this God for all deeds by intelligent creatures; fourthly, charity and neighbourly love; and fifthly, the exercise of evenhanded justice. We will not insist that there are no other principles involved in the doctrines of Abraham; but we give these points merely to convey a general idea of what he did in the fulfilment of his mission. Let us now examine briefly the effect such a system must have, if generally adopted and generally carried out in practice. Without the belief in a superior Power there cannot be imagined a being great enough to exercise any control over the actions of man; the Being to be adored must be eternal, universal, and uniform. Now precisely such a God Abraham proclaimed. The God of the scriptures is from the beginning; He made all that exists; He is of unending endurance, surviving all that can ever appear in the world; He is in every imaginable part of the creation—no space can limit Him, no obstacles can bar out his presence; and finally, He is uniform—there are no disturbing causes which can diminish his power, weaken his energies, or abridge his wisdom; there are no discoverable means to divide Him into parts, or to add aught to his greatness, felicity, or perfection, for every thing is his, and existing only by his will and sufferance. This God, according to Abraham's doctrines, has given

certain instructions to his creatures, which, since He is the Source of wisdom, must be necessarily wise, useful and immutable in their tendencies and nature. Farther, the Creator expects that those who have a knowledge of his enactments will, under pain of accountability, and with a certainty of recompense, endeavour to obey strictly what they are certified to be the will of their God. Then again these enactments, as far as mankind are concerned, demand that every man shall love his neighbour, and dispense to all, whom he can reach, those acts of kindness which he himself would desire to receive in the hour of his need. But such a system would be incomplete without the superaddition of that principle with which the Creator governs the world, and this principle we call "Justice;" this therefore too was engrafted upon Abraham's creed, and he is praised for the certainty that he would command his house after him to exercise this principle in their intercourse with others.

That Abraham was viewed with prejudice by those who profited by the superstition of the times, is but too probable; that the priests who kept the people in ignorance with regard to the true nature of the Deity should hate a man who cast, so to say, their idols to the ground, by informing every one who came to him of the pure ideas he had of the Creator, is as certain as that the doers of evil hate those whose conduct is a perpetual rebuke to their iniquity; that the tyrants who governed by debasing the mind of their subjects, who caused themselves to be looked upon as superior to the mass of mankind, did not relish the presence of the philosopher whose system rendered all men equal in obedience, in hope, as creatures of the same Father, admits of not the smallest doubt, for the general acknowledgment of these views would, if not destroy the power of kings, greatly circumscribe the same, and make men jealous of their rulers. We do not wonder, therefore, that the new civilization, as we will term it, could not advance very rapidly in the then state of the world; it contradicted every thing which was assumed as true by so many interested persons, and offered to no one individual any prominence among those who submitted to its rule. Nevertheless it is not to be doubted, that the entire system of modern civilization is based upon the early dawning thereof in the person of Abraham, which we have sketched as above. Although the constitutions of the various countries, where an enlightened liberty prevails, do not in all cases recite a belief in the existence of one God and a subjection to his laws: they in the main acknowledge these ideas in legislation and jurisprudence no less than in domestic life. In short, the Abrahamic discoveries, so to term them, in the ethical sciences, have become the standard of public

liberty, the safeguard of justice, and the prop of private life, wherever science has succeeded in dispelling the reign of ignorance, and where an enlightened worship has chased away the dark clouds of superstition. Under many appellations the God of Abraham is invoked; climes the farthest asunder send forth praises to the Everliving; and prayers ascend to Him from Ethiopia's sons and from the children of the Andes, no less than from the fair Circassian race; and the mighty Name is indeed glorious among the Gentiles.

When Moses appeared on earth to accomplish what Abraham had commenced, it was not a new theory which was proclaimed, but a confirmation of the ancient covenant. The idea of belief was not enlarged, because there could be no addition to the simplicity and truth of its first inception; the creed of Abraham was *one* God, sole, uniform, eternal; and Moses could not add to or diminish from this unchangeable truth. What then was Moses' mission? It was the establishment of a consistent code of laws in consonance with the acknowledged universality of the Almighty power. The Lord, in the code of Moses, became the chief of a civil state, in which the people were citizens and equals under the banner of obedience to the divine will; there was no one equal to the Lord, there was no one above the reach of the laws. Whoever was raised to dignity among his people, held a power delegated from on high with the concurrence and sufferance of the governed; and when the ruler ceased to shape his course by the statutes which had been prescribed for the government of the whole people, he at once lost the authority which he had abused, at times by direct divine interference, at times by the simple action of the people; of this the scriptures give so many examples that it is needless to quote them here, where we are confined to a very limited space. But in connexion with the civil code based on religion, there was another object in the legislation of Moses; and this was the uniting of the belief in the unity of the divine Essence with outward, tangible rites, which should ever remind the people to whom they had been given of the truth which they had inherited from their fathers. It is obvious that neither pictures nor the works of the chisel could effect this great end. For in the commemorative works of art, to be thus produced, the Deity also, the principal agent in all these transactions, would have to be represented; and how could this be done? Where could we possibly find a likeness or an image to figure Him by? He, who is without bodily conformation, without outward shape, could He be shadowed forth by the puerile invention of genius,—puerile, when compared with his greatness and purity? And besides, admit that it were possible; still how would it have com-

ported with divine wisdom to have permitted symbolical representations of his Being, at a time when images were the objects of adoration to all the world? Would not the recipients of the law also have soon lapsed into the folly of venerating the symbols, instead of the Deity which they personified? Wisely, therefore, did the law proscribe graven images or any representation, "because that we saw no figure whatever on the day the Lord spoke with us at Horeb from the midst of the fire." On the other hand, acts once past fade from the memory of the recipients and actors themselves; how much more is it but too certain that succeeding ages will not know of the great things that were done before their days. How beautifully therefore did the Lord provide for the remembrance of the great acts which He did for Abraham's sons when they went forth from Egypt. He bound the recollection of these mighty deeds to the observance of many ceremonials and festive institutions, which by their constant recurrence should as constantly remind the people of the causes, why they were ordained. Let us instance the Passover. The household of every believing Israelite is purified from all leaven; new utensils, different from those in general use, are procured; bread of a different nature than that used during the other parts of the year is introduced; and with the first evening of the festivals peculiar ceremonies are observed, which from their striking nature will always arrest the attention. Imagine now an inquisitive child following with eager eye his parents in their various acts of purifying and arranging the household, in their observance of the ceremonies relating to the feast, and he will naturally ask: "What is this service unto you?" And then, what a noble theme has the intelligent and pious father for dwelling on the goodness of the Lord, how He in his might broke the chain of captive forefathers—how He humbled the idols and their worshippers—how He proved his almighty power before the eyes of unbelieving men—how He demonstrated that He alone is the Creator and Ruler of the universe—and how He ordained a law of duties and observances, inasmuch as "He commanded us to do all these things, that it may be well with us all the days, and to keep us alive, as we see this day." In brief, the ceremonies, as Mendelssohn observes in his *Jerusalem*, are the constant topics of living instruction, which by exciting the attention of the inquirer afford a constant theme and an ever-recurring occasion to expatiate upon the noble truths of revealed religion, to prevent them being misunderstood by the fixedness and obscurity of outward symbols, and of being lost by want of requisite memorials.

In consequence of this union of doctrine and acts the Israelitish people became contradistinguished from all other portions of man-

kind, by a peculiarity which exposed them at once to the animadversion and suspicion of the world. They were men who believed not in the *gods*; they had no images to represent what they worshipped, and they refused to mingle by marriage and social enjoyment with those who believed not in their code. Hence there sprung up a species of repugnance of the heathen towards the Israelites; they accused them of atheism, because they rejected a plurality of gods; they were shocked at what was conceived their impiety, because they honoured not images of the divinities of the world; and they charged them with unsociality, because they could not, consistently with their faith, mingle over the wine cup and the festive board with their gentile neighbours. It is needless to argue, at this late day, the folly of these views. The worship of one God is surely no atheism; the absence of images is no impiety; and the ceremonial restrictions upon the Israelites have been long since justly regarded as the main props for the upholding of the monotheistic doctrines of Abraham and Moses; they preserved entire a people to whom the truth had been confided by the Creator himself; and nation after nation has more or less taken up the same belief, and followed as divine the precepts which the code of Israel contains. It is not to be denied that the Jews themselves have not duly honoured their divine law; they have often been rebellious; they have frequently thrown off the yoke; they have again and again walked in the ways of the heathen; still, will any one deny that they were the first, and for a long time the only, nation who believed truly in the Creator alone? who possessed and have transmitted to the world at large a code of laws which is the best safeguard of liberty? the only true standard of justice? Look at the decalogue! it is called the moral constitution of the world; and where do you find precepts so just, so simple, so cogent, embraced in so few words? Admit they are divine, (certainly we do not claim to have invented them;) still, who possessed them before all other nations? Do we then boast unjustly, when we aver that our law is the fountain of modern civilization? that whatever was good in heathen ideas had to be purified by the legislation of Moses? Surely we are correct in this assertion; and sure we are that the enlightened Christian and philosopher will gladly admit the truth of a position which scarcely admits of a doubt.

If heathen communities then looked with disdain and contempt upon the unsociable Israelites and accused them of impiety: a man acquainted with the operations of the human heart, will say that their ignorance of revelation was a natural cause of this aversion for a system which, in every point, contradicted their free notions in belief

and conduct; since heathenism allowed any addition to the catalogue of their deities, *ad infinitum*, and permitted all those acts of licentiousness which disgraced their Olympus. But what can Christians allege for continuing that silly prejudice which had its birth in periods of darkness? Do they believe in the existence of a Being, the holiest, the purest, the best that the imagination can conceive, who is the author of all? So do we. Do they believe in the REVELATION of the Most High? So do we. Do they believe themselves accountable for all acts done by them in contravention to the declared will of God? So do we. Do they hold to the sublime aphorism, "Love God above all, and thy neighbour like thyself?" So do we. Is there not sufficient agreement in our respective systems for us all to meet on common ground, and prove that we are indeed children of a common Parent? servants of the same God? "But no," say the bigots, "the Jews do not agree with us in all points; they believe not in a mediator, they reject our Messiah, and hold themselves bound by a religion of ceremonial works, long since abrogated, at the coming of Christ; hence we must endeavour to convert them, or condemn them to the pains of an everlasting damnation for their unbelief." The premises are indeed true: we totally reject the idea of a mediator, either past or to come; we reject him whom the Christians call their Messiah; and we assert that for our part the law is of the same binding force as it was in the beginning of its institution. But what has that to do with the prejudice of the world against us? Are our views so monstrous as to excite the wrath of the world against us? Let us see: we assert that the Deity is one and alone; that hence no mediator, or an emanation from the Creator, is conceivable. But why should this be a cause of prejudice against us, since the evident words of the Bible teach this doctrine, as we understand the scriptures? For thus it says, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is ONE." (Deut. vi. 4.) "Know therefore, this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God, in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else." (Ibid. iv. 39.) "See now, that I, even I, am He, and there is no God with me; I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand." (Ibid. xxxii. 39.) "Wherefore, thou art great, O Lord God: for there is none like thee, neither is there any God beside thee, according to all that we have heard with our ears." (2 Samuel vii. 22.) "That all the people of the earth may know that the Lord is God, and that there is none else." (1 Kings viii. 60.) "For thou art the glory of our strength: and in thy favour our horn shall be exalted. For the Lord is our defence: and the Holy ONE of Israel is our king." (Psalm lxxxix. 17,

18.) "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am HE; before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the LORD, and beside me there is no Saviour." (Isaiah, xliii. 10, 11.) "I even I, am HE that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins." (Ibid. 25.) "Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts; I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no god." (Ibid. xlv. 6.) "But Israel shall be saved in the Lord an everlasting salvation." (Ibid. xlv. 17.) "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else." (Ibid. xlv. 22.) "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." (Ibid. 25.) We will not multiply texts, in the limited space necessarily assigned to this article, and be content with the few already given, selected at random almost, from the ordinary version of the Bible, with but one exception. We contend from these and many others, that the scriptures teach an absolute, not a relative unity in the Godhead, that the same Being, who existed from the beginning, and who called forth all that exists, the LORD God of Hosts, is the sole Legislator and Redeemer of all his creatures. We contend that a divided unity, or a homogeneous divinity composed of parts, is nowhere spoken of in the Old Testament, our only rule of faith, and that nothing, not contained therein, can become by any possibility matter of faith and hope for an Israelite. We know well enough that some ingenious accommodations have been invented by learned men to reconcile the above texts with the received opinions of Christianity; but we have always been taught to receive the scriptures literally; we assert that the law is not allegorical; that the denunciation of punishment against us has been literally accomplished; and that, therefore, no verse of the Bible can in its primary sense be taken otherwise than in its literal and evident meaning, especially if this is the most obvious, and leads to no conclusion which is elsewhere contradicted by another biblical text. Now nothing is more evident than that the unity of God is the fundamental principle of the Bible revelation; since it was contrived, to use this word, by divine wisdom, to counteract the frightful follies of polytheism, which had overspread the world. We then say, if God be absolutely ONE, if He is not conceivable to be divided into parts, if there is no Saviour beside Him: it follows that there can be no personage who could by any possibility be called "son of god," or the mediator between God and man. An independent deity he cannot be, neither can he be an associate; and if he be neither, how can he be more a mediator than any other

creature? since one man cannot atone for the sins of another; as we are informed in Exodus, xxxii. 33: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book," which evidently teaches that every sinner has to make atonement for himself, and can obtain pardon only through the undeserved mercy of the Lord. If now the mediator is not the Creator himself, he cannot offer an atonement, nay not even himself; and if he could, he would be equal to the One from whom all has sprung, and such a being is impossible, in accordance with the testimony of the Bible.

From this it follows, that we Jews cannot admit the divinity of the Messiah of Christians, nor confide in his mission upon unitarian principles, since the books containing an account of his life all claim for him the power of mediatorship, if not an equality with the Supreme, both of which ideas we reject as unscriptural.

If then there has been as yet no manifestation of the divine will in respect to a repeal of the law (since we cannot believe a mere man to have by simple preaching and the exhibition of miracles, even admitting their authenticity, been able to abrogate what God so solemnly instituted): we again claim that the whole ceremonial and religious as well as civil legislation of Sinai is to this day unrepealed, and is consequently binding on us Israelites, the proper recipients of the Mosaic code, as on the day of its first promulgation.

We in this manner acknowledge and maintain that we do not believe in the mediatorship, nor in the mission of the Messiah of the Christians, nor in the abrogation of the Mosaic law of works. But we nevertheless contend that this rejection of the popular religion is no cause for the entertainment of any ill-will against us, nor for the efforts which some over-zealous people every now and then make for our conversion. We have already exhibited above, how the belief of Abraham, enlarged by Moses, and now acknowledged by the Jews, is one of purity and morality, and one which presents the strongest possible supports for civil society, especially a government based upon principles of equality and liberty of the person. We challenge contradiction to this position, which we sustain as impregnable both to the shafts of witticism, and the attacks of cold reasoning. We therefore say, that our presence in any community cannot work any injury to those who differ from us in religion, since we are peace-loving and loyal, wishing to do to others those acts of benevolence which we may desire to claim from them in our day of need; and that our speculative opinions cannot work any injury to the systems which exist around us, inasmuch as we do not seek to aggrandize ourselves at the expense of others, and abstain from weakening the

religious impressions of other sects, unless it be in self-defence. For the truth of this we appeal to the history of the United States, France and Holland, where the Jews have for many years enjoyed entire liberty of conscience, without any injury to other denominations or the state at large. We say, that we endeavour to instil principles of honesty in our people; and hence that but few indeed are ever brought to the bar of justice or encumber the poor and workhouses to the disgrace of their name and the reproach of their fellows in belief.* So much with respect to unjust prejudice. But with regard to the efforts at conversion they are equally senseless. To the Jew his existence is a manifestation and evident display of the divine power. How must a Christian regard it? Let us see. "Who had the Bible first?" The Jews. "Who was selected by God as the people to bear witness of his being?" The Jews. "To whom did the Lord promise love and protection?" The Jews. "To whom did he say that they should never cease to be a people?" The Jews. It then follows that Providence must have had, and consequently still have, some great and general object in preserving the Jews from annihilation, and this must be acknowledged upon Christian grounds, since Christians too admit the truth of the scriptures. Suppose now all the Jews were converted, which however is an idea not to be admitted, their existence would of a certainty be at an end; for it requires no reasoning to prove that their religion is their only preservative in their scattered state among all nations. We, as a distinct class of men, have always been the best evidence of the truth of revelation; for our being in existence with the possession of a distinct code of laws founded upon reason and truth, in ages of darkness and falsehood, can only be accounted for upon the supposition, that the laws and doctrines which are so wise and true must have sprung from the only Source of wisdom, to wit, the Author of all. Whilst, therefore, the Israelites maintain their identity; whilst they continue steadfast to Moses and the prophets: there will always be an unanswerable argument in favour of revelation to the sceptical unbeliever. But, once blot out our memorial; let our name be only a matter of history, and our existence the subject for the antiquarian's researches: and you have destroyed the very evidence on which your system must rest for support, although as Christians you claim a new revelation

* The writer of this had lately an opportunity of conversing, whilst travelling, with one of the police magistrates of the city of New York, where the largest portion of our people in this country is settled; and he assured him that but seldom are Jews brought before him for any charge whatever, even petty crimes, though the number of poor Israelites in New York is proportionately great.

for the opinions of divine things which you entertain. Still more than all this, all such attempts, as we have just alluded to, are acting against Providence; He called Abraham out of Chaldæa, and promised him, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed; He chose Isaac, and confirmed to him the covenant of Abraham; He loved Jacob, and assured him the blessings of Abraham and Isaac; He appeared to Moses and told him: "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob," (Exod. iii. 6); and all these promises are to be made void by the extermination of the distinctive character of Jacob's descendants? how are they to be distinguished as "the people of God," as the sons of Israel, if they mingle with you in communion of worship and inter-marriages, and become with you one people? One would think that the many abortive attempts at force, at persuasion, at bribery, had all been tried in vain long enough to prove that, if God wishes our destruction, these are not the means to effect it; and still the world is but little wiser for all these failures, and the same routine, all except the slaying of Jews, is gone over again at this day, to bring about the conversion of our people, as was done in former times. One country will not admit our people to an equality of rights; another, more barbarous yet, although Christian, enlightened and highly civilized, restricts the number of Jews in its dominions, permits only a certain number to marry, and confines our existing population to certain, and these very narrow, limits in the towns where they dwell; elsewhere they are taxed for the right of protection—even the food they consume becomes an especial source of revenue to the government; in other places again they cannot hold landed estates; other countries will not admit them within their boundaries; whilst every where, even in free and enlightened America, other denominations combine for the purpose of bringing about their conversion, and raise funds and form especial societies to bring about this consummation so devoutly desired by many. Who does not see, that such proceedings are only too well calculated to keep alive prejudices, unfounded and unjust, against the sons of Israel? Every one knows the influence which ministers of religion have over their flocks; and if the heads, then, constantly pray for the conversion of the Jews; if they constantly league together for this purpose; if they hold them up as children of damnation for their unbelief: it would be wonderful indeed if the masses did not feel a certain aversion for those men whose obduracy and unbelief cause so much pain and labour to the good men whom they are accustomed to regard with love and veneration. Where we are known, our characters and our course of life

will be always the best answers to all complaints, and the best defence against all supposed charges. But in communities even where we are most numerous, there are many who are necessarily unacquainted with us and our opinions; and still they may have an important bearing upon our happiness and welfare; we are therefore anxious that they should not hold an unworthy opinion of us or our creed. Besides this, we venerate the name of Israel, we hold dear the bond which entwines our destiny with the lot and the fame of the great ones of old; and therefore, even if there were no personal disadvantage connected with the prejudice against ourselves, we would prize it beyond all could we have the happiness of witnessing among the world at large a proper appreciation of the services to religion, to science, to government, to order, to humanity, which mankind owes to the patriarchs, the prophets, the doctors, the martyrs of the house of Israel. We ask for no prerogative from the world; our faith is one of opinion, and can flourish as well under persecution as when in command of empires; our God can and does shield us, whether we are afflicted or in prosperity: but we ask to be left alone undisturbed in the profession of those peculiar opinions which we claim to be the emanation of the Supreme Being; we ask of all, to let us pursue the even tenor of our way, as good citizens and faithful subjects to the laws of the land; and no one will ever have cause to complain that the Jews, as such, have interfered with his rights, or diminished in the least the full exercise of his political or religious privileges.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE JEWS.

Properly speaking, the Jews have no profession of faith; they hold the whole Word of God to be alike fundamental, and that in sanctity there is no difference between the verses "And the sons of Dan, Hushim," (Gen. xlv. 23,) and "I am the Lord thy God," (Exod. xx. 2.) The whole Bible has the same immortal, infallible Author; consequently whatever He has written for our instruction must be equally holy. To us the things handed down may appear unimportant; but we do *not* know what great truths may be connected with the simplest word embraced in the Bible. The believing Israelite, therefore, searches the scriptures as the most mysterious, the holiest gift, although the text is so evident as to afford a sure guide to his steps through his earthly pilgrimage, and to point his way to heaven. He endeavours to find in the pages thereof the best account of the ways of God with man, and a solution of the question, "What does the Lord ask of me?" Nothing therefore can be unim-

portant to him which has been written by his almighty Father, and every word he finds recorded there he must accordingly receive as his rule of faith. Let it be understood, that the Israelite's religion, though based on faith, is not a theoretical system, but one of action and duties; for when the Lord revealed himself on Mount Sinai it was a *practical* course of life. He pointed out in preference to a system of belief or matters of credence. Without faith, or a sincere conviction, in other words, of the truth of God and his law, no one would to a certainty obey a code which, in every step he takes, places some restriction upon his conduct or pursuits. Nevertheless no life can be measured by the standard of the law, which is only rich in sentiments, but poor in deeds. This being the case, it is self-evident that the ideas which are the foundation of our religion must spring out of the law and the revelation which we have received for our guidance; and the whole series of doctrines which is evolved by a study of the law and the prophets must be accepted by all Israelites as the truth which they ought implicitly to confide in; since the *ideas* of religion cannot be less true, than the duties with which they stand in connexion, are the infallible will of God. All this would give us then the doctrine "that the whole Bible is the faith of the Israelite." But, though to the thinking and pious such a reference might be enough, there would be many a one who would find it difficult to trace sufficiently clearly the doctrines of the Bible amidst the mass of duties on the one hand, and narrations and predictions on the other, which the various books of scripture so bountifully contain. Pious men therefore have endeavoured to *condense* the biblical dogmas for the use of the nation at large, in order to afford at first sight a comprehensive view of all that, which according to our received mode of interpretation we are obliged to believe in with an entire faith as children of Israel. Nevertheless it must be understood that these dogmas, or ARTICLES OF FAITH, though universally admitted as true, have never yet become a TEST of a Jewish experience; since it is enough for us if we admit the truth of the whole Bible, which of itself includes the belief in what have been termed "the Articles of Maimonides," which learned doctor was probably the first who reduced his religion to a limited number of fundamental principles, without thereby excluding the necessity of believing implicitly whatever other doctrines might otherwise be drawn from the sacred Text. In other words, whatever principles are deducible from Holy Writ, and whatever doctrines the Bible contains, are one and all subjects on which no Israelite can conscientiously permit himself to speculate,

much less to doubt; and the articles of faith are therefore nothing but a summary, serving to classify in a simple manner the chief and evident deductions from the scriptures.

Having premised this, to avoid giving a false view of our creed, of which no trace as an entire system can be discovered in so many words, either in the Bible or in the writings of our early doctors: we will proceed to lay down the three great bases of our belief:

I. We believe in the existence of the Deity, the Creator of all things.

II. We believe in the existence of a revelation by the Creator of his will.

III. We believe in the existence of a just system of reward and punishment, or a full accountability for all our acts.

Being compelled to condense as much as possible in this article, we cannot go over a great number of arguments to prove, what is otherwise so self-evident, that these three principles are the sole rational foundation of all religion; since the belief in the Creator gives us a Supreme Being to worship; a revelation furnishes us with a knowledge of what He requires at our hands; and, lastly, the existence of an equitable system of accountability places before us the most urgent motives for obedience to whatever we are certified to be the will of God.

But the Bible reveals to us ampler details of doctrines, in part especially applicable to us as Israelites to whom the law was first given, and partly of universal applicability. Of the latter we have generally assumed thirteen cardinal principles which are the key of our theological views; they are—

1. The belief in an almighty Creator, who alone has called all things into being, and still continues to govern the world which He has made.

2. The belief in the absolute and perfect **UNITY** of the Creator, that He is therefore indivisible in every sense of the word, always the same, who was, is, and ever will be, unchanged as from the beginning.

3. The belief in the incorporeality of the Creator, that He is not a material being, and cannot be affected by accidents which affect material things.

4. The belief in the absolute and perfect eternity of the Creator.

5. The belief, that the Creator is the sole being to whom we should pray, since there is no one who shares his powers, that we should address our prayers to him.

6. The belief in the truth of all the words of the prophets.

7. The belief in the truth of the prophecy of Moses, and that he was the greatest of all the prophets and wise men who have lived before him or will come after him.

8. The belief in the identity of the law which we now have, and that it is unchanged, and the very one which was given to Moses.

9. The belief in the permanency of the law, and that there has not been, nor will there ever be, another law promulgated by the Creator.

10. The belief in the omniscience of the Creator.

11. The belief that the Creator will reward those who keep his commandments, and punish those who transgress them.

12. The belief in the coming of the King Messiah, who is to accomplish for the world and Israel all that the prophets have foretold concerning him. And

13. The belief in the resurrection of the dead, when it may please the Almighty to send his spirit to revive those who sleep in the dust.

It were easy enough to prove all the above from scripture passages; but it is deemed unnecessary in this mere summary of our faith, nothing doubting but that the inquirer will look for farther light in works treating especially on this important subject. It will be seen that a distinctive feature in our belief is "the permanency of the law revealed on Sinai through Moses the father of the prophets," which precludes the admission of any new revelation, or the abrogation of the old covenant. Another, "the belief in the absolute unity of God," with the addition that "there is no being but the Creator to whom we should pray," precludes the admissibility of a mediator, or the mediating power between God and us mortal sinners of any being whose existence the imagination can by any possibility conceive as possible. We think and maintain that these principles are legitimate deductions of the text of Holy Writ; and we must therefore, if even on no other grounds, reject the principles and doctrines of Christianity which teach, first, that a new covenant has been made between God and mankind other than the revelation at Horeb; and, secondly, that there is a mediator, an emanation of the Deity, through whose merits only man can be absolved from sin, and through whose intercession prayers will be accepted. All this is foreign to our view of scriptural truth, and as such we reject it, and hold fast to the doctrines which we have received from our fathers.

The Messiah whom we expect is not to be a god, nor a part of the godhead, nor a son of god in any sense of the word; but simply a man eminently endowed, like Moses and the prophets in the days of the Bible, to work out the will of God on earth in all that the

prophets have predicted of him. His coming, we believe, will be the signal for universal peace, universal freedom, universal knowledge, universal worship of the One Eternal; objects all of high import, and well worthy to be attested by the visible display of the divine glory before the eyes of all flesh, just as was the presence of the Lord manifested at Sinai, when the Israelites stood assembled to receive the law which was surrendered to their keeping. In the days of this august ruler the law, which was at first given as "an inheritance of the congregation of Jacob," will become the only standard of righteousness, of salvation, for all mankind, when will be fulfilled to its fullest extent the blessings conferred upon Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that "in their seed all the families of the earth should be blessed." We believe farther, that the time of this great event is hidden from our knowledge, and is only known to the Creator, who in his own good time will regenerate the earth, remove the worship of idols, banish all erroneous beliefs, and establish his kingdom firmly and immovably over the hearts of all sons of man, when all will invoke Him in truth, and call Him God, King, Redeemer, the One who was, is, and will be, for ever and ever. We believe that the time may be distant, thousands of years removed; but we confidently look forward to its coming, in the full confidence that He who has so miraculously preserved his people among so many trials and dangers, is able and willing to fulfil all He has promised, and that his power will surely accomplish what his goodness has foretold; and that He will not rest in the fulfilment of his word, till all the world shall acknowledge his power, and ceaseless incense ascend to his holy Name from the rising of the sun even unto his setting; when the altars of falsehood shall crumble and the dominion of unbelief be swept from the face of the earth.

THE JEWS IN THE UNITED STATES.

From the smallness of the numbers of our people, compared with the rest of mankind, it will be readily understood that, comparatively speaking, but few Jews will be found in America. Still despite of this fact, they are found in every portion of the Union, with the exception almost (for there are a few even there,) in the northern range of states. Probably the first settlement of Jews took place in New Amsterdam, when it was under the Dutch government, about 1660. They no doubt were Spaniards and Portuguese who, like their brethren who were settled in Holland, fled from the bloody Inquisition to seek

refuge under the equitable protection of the laws of the Batavian republic. The writer of this has learnt that a correspondence is yet in existence which took place between the Israelites and the Dutch authorities of New Amsterdam; but he has never seen it, wherefore he is unable to say any thing with precision farther than he has stated above. This much, however, he believes certain, that the number of our people did not increase rapidly, since we are not friendly to making proselytes, and owing to the great difficulties emigrants of our persuasion must be exposed to in new communities on account of the duties of our religion. Be this as it may, but one synagogue was needed in New York, till about 1827, when a second one was established in the central part of the city. Since that period four other congregations have been organized, and all the places of worship, though so rapidly multiplied, are frequently over-full, so as to require temporary meeting places. The number of Jews in the city of New York, is said to be about 10,000, and rapidly increasing by emigration from Europe, owing to the oppressive laws enforced against us in many countries as stated in a preceding part of this article. There are two congregations in Albany, and one or more in the country, of which, however, I have too vague information to say any thing with certainty.

A few years before the American revolution a congregation assembled in Newport, Rhode Island; but with the falling off of the business of that place, after the conclusion of the peace of 1783, the Jewish population left it by degrees, some going to New York, some to Richmond, and others to different other towns. There are a synagogue and burying ground, both said to be in good order,—a legacy having been left by the son of the former minister, Touro, to keep them from falling into decay.

In Pennsylvania Israelites were settled long before the revolution in various places. But, I believe, that no regular congregation was organized till about 1780, when the occupation of New York by the British induced many from that place to come hither with their minister, Gershom Mendes Seixas; and a synagogue was erected upon the site of the present building, and consecrated about the fall of 1781. There are now three congregations in Philadelphia, numbering about from 1500 to 1800 souls; one congregation is at Easton, one in Hanover, and considerable settlements in Franklin county, Bucks, and elsewhere, which will no doubt be organized as congregations before long.

In Maryland the Jews were, until lately, excluded from a participation of equal rights; but soon after the repeal of their disabilities, many Europeans joined the former few settlers, and there is now a considerable congregation of about 1500 souls in Baltimore, where

there is a synagogue. There are also a few families in Frederick, Hagerstown, &c.

In Virginia the Jews settled about 1780, or even earlier; but their number is small in that state; and there are but two congregations in the whole state, and both at Richmond. Others dwell at Petersburg, Norfolk, Lynchburg, Wheeling, but they amount in the whole state to scarcely more than 600.

In North Carolina, where the constitution excludes us from the rights of citizens, there are but a few families.

But in South Carolina we are much more numerous, and Israelites are found in all parts of the state; still there is but one regular congregation, at Charleston, where there is a handsome synagogue; the congregation was organized in 1750.

In Georgia there is a synagogue in Savannah. The first Jews came over soon after General Oglethorpe, in 1733; but they have never been very numerous; though it appears from present indications that many European emigrants, and persons from the north will, it is likely, soon seek a home in that state.

In the southern and western states the arrival of Israelites is but recent; still there is a congregation at Mobile; another, numbering about 125 families, in New Orleans; another at Louisville; two at Cincinnati; one or two in Cleveland, and one at St. Louis. There are probably others, but they have not become generally known. A small congregation also has recently been formed at New Haven, in Connecticut, probably the only one in the New England States, unless Boston be an exception.

We have no ecclesiastical authorities in America, other than the congregations themselves. Each congregation makes its own rules for its government, and elects its own minister, who is appointed without any ordination, induction in office being made through his election, which is made for a term of years or during good behaviour, as it may meet the wish of the majority. As yet we have no colleges, or public schools of any kind, with the exception of one in New York, under the direction of the Rev. Samuel M. Isaacs, one in Baltimore, and another in Cincinnati, and Sunday schools for religious instruction in New York, Philadelphia, Richmond, Charleston, Columbia, S. C., Savannah, and Cincinnati. There can be no doubt that something will be done for education, as soon as we become more numerous. The American Jews have but one religious periodical, and this is printed in Philadelphia; it is called "The Occident and American Jewish Advocate," and appears monthly.

In all our congregations where the necessity demands it, there are

ample provisions made for the support of the poor, and we endeavour to prevent, if possible, any Israelite from being sent to the poor house, or to sink into crime for want of the means of subsistence.

Upon the whole, we have increased in every respect within the last five years; and we invoke the blessing of Heaven that He may prosper our undertakings, and give us the means to grow in grace and piety, that we may be able to show the world the true effects of the law of God upon the life of a sincere Israelite, which must render him acceptable to his neighbours of every creed, and a worthy servant in the mansion of his heavenly Father.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.*

BY S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D.,

GETTYSBURG, PA.

THE name of Martin Luther, now familiar to almost every school-boy, forms one of the most prominent waymarks in the history both of the world and the church. It has immortalized his age among the generations gone by; and one can hardly hear it pronounced without being at the same moment transported back to the scenes and events of that ecclesiastical revolution which shook Europe to its very centre, and from the cell of a monastery opened upon the world that dawning of science and truth which shall shine on, with unwaning brightness, to its perfect day.

But while all recognise the name of the Reformer, and its connexion with the past and present condition of Christendom in the general: few, comparatively, are well acquainted with the history of his peculiar opinions and those of the past and present generations of his followers. In reviving our own and our readers' acquaintance with our Lutheran brethren, we introduce to the friends of the Redeemer of lost men, an ancient, honoured, and most efficient branch of that church which he ransomed with blood, and which he employs in carrying forward the triumphs of his grace over sin and the powers of darkness.†

"The Lutheran Church is indebted for her name to the derision of the Catholics. The distinguished Papal theologian, Dr. Eckius, the opponent of Luther and Carlstadt, in the celebrated disputation at Leipsic, in the year 1519, wishing to show his contempt for Luther

* The following sketch of the Lutheran Church is compiled almost entirely from several publications of the Rev. Dr. S. S. Schmucker, Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, from an excellent article in the American Quarterly Register, by the Rev. Mr. Harris of Boston, which is derived principally from the same source, and from the Lutheran Almanac of 1843.

† Quarterly Register, of 1843, p. 378.

and his cause, and not dreaming whereunto this matter of the Reformation would grow, first stigmatized the friends of the reformer as *Lutherans*, with the same feelings with which we speak of the Owenites and Fanny Wright men of our day. The term being regarded as a happy conceit, was soon spread among the enemies of the cause; and its friends, though opposed to it in principle, responded to the name, because they were not ashamed of their leader. But the name officially adopted by the Lutheran reformers was that of the Evangelical Church, that is, the gospel church, in antithesis to the legal ritual of the Old Testament, the very name recently adopted by the united Lutheran and Reformed Church in Prussia. Luther himself, like the great apostle of the gentiles, protested most decidedly against the use of his name as the Shibboleth of a sect, and it is to be regretted that his advice was disregarded.”*

“The Lutheran Church in this country has, in common with that of the German Reformed, also been distinctively termed the *German* church. This designation must not be understood as implying the limitation of the worship of either of these churches to the German language. It is known to the intelligent reader, that in different countries the services of the Lutheran Church are conducted in the Swedish, the Norwegian, the Danish, the Icelandic, the Russian and the French, as well as in the English and German languages. Yet it is true, that as Germany was the cradle of the Reformation, she was also the primitive seat of that church, which grew out of the Reformation in the land of Luther. Germany is still the most extensive seat of Lutheranism. No other foreign country is therefore fraught with such interesting and hallowed associations to the great mass of American Lutherans as Germany, the mother of the Reformation, the cradle of Lutheranism, the land where our fathers proclaimed the gospel of salvation, where Spener sowed the seed of truth, where Arndt preached and wrote and lived his ‘True Christianity,’ where Franke wrought his works of love, and where believing Luther poured his prayer of faith into the lap of God! But it is not only to Lutheran minds that Germany is encircled with interesting associations. Although the populace are too little acquainted with the fact, yet what intelligent scholar does not know that the Germans constitute one of the most distinguished branches of the human family, and that at different periods throughout the two thousand years of their national history, they have excelled in all that is truly noble and praiseworthy in heathen virtue,

* Schmucker's Portraiture of Lutheranism, pp. 8, 9.

or interesting in the fruits of an enlightened and active Christian piety? Germany was originally inhabited by a heroic and martial people, whose origin is enveloped in some obscurity. Their language and religion point us to Asia. They certainly proceeded from the north of the Euxine Sea, and, known by the names of Scythians, Teutones, Franks, &c., overspread all western Europe. The English are, both as to language and population, in part descended from one of these German tribes, the Saxons, who at an early day conquered Britain and formed the Anglo-Saxon race, from whom a portion of our citizens are descended. When first visited by the Romans, about the time of our Saviour, the Germans had already for ages inhabited the country, and had lost all traces of their earliest history. Divided into many independent tribes, and often engaged in intestine wars, each tribe acknowledged no laws but those enacted by the majority at a general council. Far removed from the refinement and literary character of the Romans, they were alike free from their licentiousness and effeminacy. Hospitality and conjugal fidelity were prominent characteristics of the Germans; and a promise, given to friend or foe, they held inviolable, even at the risk of life. They cherished a firm belief of the immortality of the soul, and of future retribution. They were indeed polytheists, but their religion was of the sublimer cast. They neither bowed down to idols, nor worshipped in temples made with hands, but offered their devotions in open groves, under the broad canopy of heaven; for, says the Roman historian, they regarded their gods as too sacred and great to be confined in temples, or represented by idols of wood or stone.”*

In the time of Julius Cæsar the Romans marked them out for conquest; but after repeated attempts to subdue them, they were defeated, and they relinquished the object about the thirteenth year of the Christian era. Subsequently, after numerous internal dissensions and external wars between their different tribes and the Romans, the latter, with the Saxons, under the Emperor Probus, succeeded in conquering the Franks and the Alemanni, two of the principal German nations, about A. D. 270. This conquest, however, the last of a political character which Rome achieved, was not permanent. In the fifth century, the Roman empire was assaulted on all sides by the northern and eastern barbarians, who rapidly spread their ravages and conquests over all Europe.

“Of the different tribes of this numerous family which overspread

* Schmucker's Portraiture, pp. 10, 11.

all western Europe, those only retain the name of Germans, in modern history, who reside in the territory denominated Germany. Their martial spirit rendered difficult the introduction of Christianity among them, which was however effected, at least in name, successively among the different tribes, from the third to the eighth century. The forgiving and submissive spirit of the gospel gained a tardy victory over their warlike minds; as was strikingly illustrated in the instance of Clovis,* King of the Franks, a tribe that settled in Gaul. On one occasion, whilst Remigius was preaching to them, and depicting in glowing colours the sufferings of the Saviour when suspended on the cross, the king, no longer able to restrain his spirit, cried out in the midst of the congregation, ‘Ah, if I had been there with my Franks, the Jews should not have crucified the Lord!’ Unhappily the Christianity first introduced among them was strongly tinged with the corruptions of Rome, and in the progress of ages, the Germans participated extensively in the increasing superstitions and degeneracy which reigned at the fountain head. But in the providence of God it was reserved for this heroic and undaunted people, to take the lead in breaking the bonds by which Europe had for ages been held in subjection. ‘Whilst,’ says the distinguished Lutheran historian, Dr. Mosheim, ‘the Roman pontiff slumbered in security at the head of the church, and saw nothing throughout the vast extent of his dominion but tranquillity and submission, and while the worthy and pious professors of genuine Christianity almost despaired of seeing that reformation, on which their ardent desires and expectations were bent: an obscure and inconsiderable person arose, on a sudden, in the year 1517, and laid the foundation of this long-expected change, by opposing with undaunted resolution his single force to the torrent of Papal ambition and despotism. This remarkable man was *Martin Luther*, of Eisleben, in Saxony,† an Augustinian monk, and professor of theology in the university which had been erected at Wittenberg a few years before.’ It was this interesting people, after they had thrown off the yoke of Rome, and, through the instrumentality of their countryman Luther and others, received the pure and unadulterated word of God, that constituted themselves a reformed, an evangelical church, which has been denominated Lutheran.”‡

“In the year 1507, at the age of twenty-four years, in the seclusion of monastic life, Luther, by what we call accident, but, in reality, by

* Clovis belonged to the German, Salian tribe; Henke, vol. i. p. 387.

† Mosheim, vol. iii. p. 25.

‡ Schmucker's Portraiture, pp. 12-14.

the ordering of Him whose empire is universal, found among the musty tomes of the convent library a long-neglected Latin Bible. This immediately became his daily counsellor. The light of inspired truth soon disclosed to him the errors and deficiency of the Romish creed, even before he could plainly discern the more excellent way. His attainments placed him, the following year, in a situation which compelled him to acquire a knowledge of the Hebrew language. In the year 1517, while engaged in the performance of his duties of a professor and ecclesiastic, particularly at the confessional, he discovered the influence of Rome's corrupt system of *indulgences*. He refused absolution to those who pleaded them as a substitute for penance. This of course led them to complain to the friar from whom they had procured them. A violent controversy ensued between the friar and Luther, which ultimately brought the Reformer to an open rupture with the See of Rome. At two of the principal universities, as well as at the Papal court, the indignation of the church was expressed by a public conflagration of his published writings. And in return, Luther, after previous notice, and in the presence of an immense concourse of spectators, committed the authoritative books of the Roman hierarchy, together with the condemnatory bull of the pontiff, to the flames. The Papal bull was renewed, accompanied by a sentence of excommunication; but its reception served only to show its diminished power against the advancing public sentiment. Recourse was now had to the civil authorities; and the assembled princes and nobles of Germany were urged to bring the Reformer to their bar for trial. A summons was issued accordingly; and Luther, notwithstanding the remonstrance of influential and powerful friends, fearlessly placed himself at their tribunal. Here again the public sympathies were with him. His reception was marked with a higher degree of enthusiastic attention and favour, than that of the emperor himself. When confronted with his prosecutors, he respectfully but firmly maintained the stand he had taken; avowed himself the author of the writings which bore his name; boldly vindicated the truth of his opinions; and refused to recant, unless convinced and refuted from the scriptures themselves. He left the council unmolested, but was followed by a royal edict of condemnation. And though placed for a time in confinement for his security, by the hand of friendship, he did not cease his labours to expose and refute the corruptions and heresies of Papal Rome, and in defence of the doctrines which he had espoused and promulgated. In the mean time, almost every city of Saxony embraced his doctrines, and the principles of the Reformation spread and prevailed. On his return to Wittenberg, the place of his resi-

dence, he resolved that the 'lamp of life,' the scriptures, which had illumined and scattered the darkness of his own mind, and which he had in part translated into German, at Wartburg, in his confinement, should be given to the community around him; publishing and circulating each portion as soon as it was revised or translated, until in the course of twelve years the whole was completed. The people soon began to see the contrast between the laws of Christ's kingdom and those of the Roman hierarchy; and both princes and their subjects openly renounced the Papal supremacy. Wrath was kindled against them to the uttermost. The Vatican thundered its anathemas; the civil power was extended to crush the *heresy* and its advocates together; but it was all in vain; 'so mightily grew the word of God and prevailed.' Luther maintained his stand against both the civil and ecclesiastical hostility; till in 1524, seven years after he commenced the work of reform, he threw aside the monastic dress, assumed the garb of a preacher, abjured his vow of celibacy and united himself in marriage with a *nun*, which caused the impotent rage of his adversaries to burn with still greater fury. The German princes, however, either from political or religious motives, treated him with clemency. Many of them were his firm friends; and the Elector of Saxony, who had been his constant patron, instituted measures by which the Lutheran religion was established throughout his dominions."*

Unhappy divisions, however, arose among the reformers themselves. And while the doctrines which Luther taught became popular even in France and England: these divisions weakened their cause at home, and put arguments against them into the mouths of their enemies. Repeated efforts were made to turn the political influence of the country against the Reformation and its friends, and in 1529 the German Diet proceeded to adopt measures to check its progress. These were resisted by that portion of the Diet who were favourable to the cause of reform; and when they found that their remonstrances availed nothing, they entered a solemn protest against the proceedings, and appealed to the emperor and a future council. Hence arose the name PROTESTANT, which has ever since distinguished the other portions of the Christian world from the adherents of the Church of Rome. At a subsequent Diet, held at Augsburg, Melancthon, who had been directed to prepare a statement of the doctrines of the reformed, presented the celebrated confession of their faith, which has

* Quarterly Register, pp. 379, 380.

since been known as the "Augsburg Confession." The opposition of the Papists to this gave rise to another controversy; to quell which, imperial edicts and the secular power were put in full requisition. This led to political union and resistance on the part of the Protestants, and an alliance between them and the governments of France and of England, whose sovereigns having each a personal pique against the German emperor, were disposed to fan this flame of political discord. All attempts to abolish heresy by force were now relinquished by the emperor, and a truce followed, during which the principles of the Reformation made still farther advances. Many who had feared to avow their enmity to the Pope now publicly renounced their allegiance to him, and whole cities and provinces of Germany enlisted under the religious standards of Luther. Various unsuccessful attempts were made by the emperor and the Roman Pontiff to terminate the religious controversies, through the space of several years, during which a revised confession of the Protestant faith was prepared by Luther, commonly known as "The Articles of Smalcald," which usually accompanies the published creeds and confessions of the Lutheran Church. The emperor and the Protestants also proposed various methods of reconciliation, but these were uniformly defeated by the artifices of the Romanists. At length, wearied with the opposition of the Protestants on the one hand, and of the Papists on the other, to every measure proposed for settling their disputes: he began to listen to the suggestions of the Pontiff to end the controversies by the force of arms. The Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, who were the chief supporters of the Protestant cause, made corresponding arrangements for defence. But before the commencement of these sanguinary conflicts, Luther died in peace in his native town, (Eisleben,) Feb. 18, 1546, aged 62 years. The first contest resulted in the defeat of the Protestants, chiefly through the perfidy of the nephew of the elector. Discouragement and gloom seemed now to gather around their cause. Through fear and by compulsion, they were made to yield up the decision of their religious disputes to a council to be assembled by the Pope. The providence of God interposed at this juncture. A rumour of the plague in the city where they were convened caused them to disperse, and the emperor could not prevail on "his Holiness" to re-assemble them. The Popedom, however, having in 1548 passed into other hands, measures were taken for convening another general council. The Elector of Saxony, perceiving some mischievous designs on the part of the emperor against the liberties of the German princes, determined to crush his

project and his ambition. He secretly directed the Saxon divines not to proceed as far as Trent, the place of assembly, but to stop at Nuremberg. He also formed a secret alliance with the King of France and several of the German princes, for defending and securing their liberties; and in 1552, he marched with a powerful army against the emperor at Inspruck, who finding himself unexpectedly, and without preparation, in the power of the Protestant chieftain, was compelled to accede to such terms as the latter should propose; and the result was the ratification of the treaty of Passau, which was considered by the Protestants as the basis of their religious freedom. By the terms of this treaty a Diet was to be assembled in six months to determine an amicable settlement of the controversies. This Diet after much delay at length met at Augsburg, in the year 1555, and brought their long-continued troubles to a peaceful termination. After various and protracted discussions, it was finally enacted by the Diet, on the 25th of September of that year, "that the Protestants who adopted the Augsburg Confession should, for the future, be considered as entirely free from the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, and from the authority and supervision of the Roman bishops; that they were at perfect liberty to enact laws for themselves on all matters pertaining to their religious sentiments, discipline and worship; that all the inhabitants of the German empire should be allowed to judge for themselves in religious concerns; and to join themselves to that church whose doctrine and worship they deemed the most pure and consonant to the spirit of true Christianity; and that all who should injure or persecute any person under religious pretences, and on account of their opinions, should be treated as enemies of the empire, invaders of its liberties, and disturbers of its peace."*

It was from the church thus reformed, indoctrinated and established, that the German Lutheran Christians in the United States descended. "After the establishment of the Lutheran Church in Germany, by the labours of Luther, Melancthon, and others, about 1525, when the Elector John of Saxony first publicly adopted the amended system, the Lutheran doctrines were introduced into Sweden by the instrumentality of Olaus Petri in 1527, under the sanction of King Gustavus Vasa Ericson. Into Denmark the Lutheran doctrines were fully introduced in 1527, in the reign of Frederick, after some preparatory steps by Christiern II. The Lutheran Church is also established in Norway, Lapland, Finland, and Iceland, and has some congregations in Hungary, France, and Asia.

* Quarterly Register, p. 381.

According to the best authorities, the Lutheran population in the world in 1836, was as follows :*

Prussia, - - - - -	8,000,000
Austria, - - - - -	2,250,000
Saxony, - - - - -	2,000,000
Württemberg, - - - - -	1,125,000
Hanover, - - - - -	1,000,000
The other German States, - - - - -	2,000,000
France, - - - - -	1,500,000
Denmark, - - - - -	2,000,000
Norway and Sweden, - - - - -	4,000,000
Russia in Europe, - - - - -	2,500,000
Russia in Asia, - - - - -	100,000
Poland, - - - - -	500,000
Netherlands, - - - - -	120,000
Turkey in Europe, - - - - -	15,000
England, - - - - -	40,000
Italy, - - - - -	500
United States, - - - - -	600,000

In Russia there were 820 Lutheran churches in the year 1835, and 493 Lutheran ministers.

The United Brethren (Moravians), though peculiar in their church government, have always retained the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, as their symbol, and may be regarded as a branch of the Lutheran Church.†

The whole Lutheran population in the world has been estimated by the best authorities at from 27 to 30,000,000.

“The earliest settlement of Lutherans in this country, was made by emigrants from Holland to New York, soon after the first establishment of the Dutch in that city, then called New Amsterdam, which was in 1621. This fact, which is of some historic interest, rests upon the authority of the venerable patriarch of American Lutheranism, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. ‘As I was detained at New York, (says he in his report to Halle,) I took some pains to acquire correct information concerning the history of the Lutheran Church in that city. This small congregation took its rise almost at the first settlement of the country. Whilst the territory yet belonged to Holland, the few Low Dutch Lutherans were compelled to hold their worship in private; but after it passed into the possession of the

* See the Berlin (Prussia) Kirchenzeitung of 1836.

† See Schmucker's Popular Theology, p. 32, 3d ed.

British, in 1664, liberty was granted them by all the successive governors to conduct their worship publicly without any obstruction.* The establishment of Lutherans was therefore made little more than a century after the re-discovery of America by Columbus, in 1492;† within a few years of the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock, 1620, and whilst the 'Thirty Years' War‡ was raging in Germany, and threatening to exterminate Protestantism from Europe. Their first minister was Jacob Fabricius, who arrived in 1669, but after eight years' labour, left them and connected himself with the Swedish Lutherans.§ The names of his immediate successors we have not found; but from 1703 to 1747, their pastors were the Rev. Messrs. Falkner, from 1703 till 1725, Berkenmayer, and Knoll, and subsequently Rochemdahler, Wolf, Hartwick, and others. The first church (a log building) was erected 1671, and Mr. Muhlenberg says, it was in a dilapidated state when it was taken down and its place supplied by one of stone, in the time of Mr. Berkenmayer. The cause of the emigration from Holland we have not seen stated; but it may easily be conjectured, as the emigrants left that country a few years after the famous Synod of Dort (1618), and whilst the government was enforcing the intolerant decrees of that body.||

“To this settlement succeeded that of the Swedes on the Delaware, in 1636, about ten or twelve years after that in New Amsterdam, and sixteen years after the arrival of the Pilgrims at Plymouth. This colony was first contemplated during the reign of Gustavus Adolphus, and was sanctioned by that enlightened and illustrious king. It was delayed by the commencement of the 'Thirty Years' War in Germany;

* The Lutheran Herald, vol. iii. No. 1, contains the following particulars: “Indeed, so great was the number of Lutherans, even at this time, that the very next year, 1665, after the English flag had been displayed from Fort Amsterdam, they petitioned for liberty to send to Germany a call for a regular pastor. This petition Governor Nicols of course granted, and in February, 1669, two years after he had left the government, the Rev. Jacobus Fabricius arrived in the colony and began his pastoral labours.” “On the 13th of October, 1669, Lord Lovelace, who had succeeded Gov. Nicols, publicly proclaimed his having received a letter from the Duke of York, expressing his pleasure that the Lutherans should be tolerated.”

† It is now highly probable that America was not first discovered by Columbus; but Greenland had been visited by Eirek, the Red, and New England by Biarni Heriulphson, the former in 982, the latter in 985. See Discoveries of the North Men.

‡ This most memorable of all the wars in the history of Protestantism, which deluged Germany in blood, and had it not been for the magnanimous aid of Gustavus Adolphus, and his brave Swedes, would perhaps have extirpated Protestantism from the earth, was commenced in 1618 and ended in 1648.

§ Fabricius took charge of the Swedish church at Wicaco, now Southwark, Philadelphia, where he laboured fourteen years, during nine of which he was blind. He died 1692.

|| Schmucker's Retrospect, pp. 5-7.

but after Sweden's noble-hearted monarch had poured out his life's blood on the plains of Lützen, it was revived and executed under the auspices of his distinguished prime minister Oxenstiern. For many years this colony prospered, but receiving no accessions from the parent country, it never increased much in numbers; the rising generation comingled with the surrounding English and Germans, and at the present day the Swedish language is entirely abandoned in their worship. For many years their ministers, who were generally men of sterling character, were in habits of the most friendly intercourse and ecclesiastical co-operation with their German Lutheran brethren; but the prevalence of the English language, having early placed them under obligation to our Episcopal brethren who supplied them with ministrations in that language, these churches, three or four in number, have successively fallen into Episcopal hands.*

“The third settlement of Lutherans in this country was that of the Germans, which gradually spread over Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and the interior of New York and the Western States. The grant of Pennsylvania was given to Penn by Charles II. in 1680; and from this date, till about twenty years afterwards, many hundreds of families emigrated to Pennsylvania. The tide of German emigration, however, fairly commenced in 1710, when about 3000 Germans, chiefly Lutheran, oppressed by Romish intolerance, went from the Palatinate to England in 1709, and were sent by Queen Anne to New York the succeeding year. In 1713 one hundred and fifty families settled in Schoharie; and in 1717, we find in the Colonial Records of Pennsylvania, that the governor of the province felt it his duty to call the attention of the ‘Provincial Council’ to the fact ‘that great numbers of foreigners from Germany, strangers to our language and constitution, had lately been imported into the province.’ The council enacted, that every master of a vessel should report the emigrants he brought over, and that they should all repair to Philadelphia within one month to take the oath of allegiance to the government,† that it might be seen whether they were ‘friends or enemies to his majesty’s government.’ In 1727, the year memorable alike for Francke’s death, and the origin of the Moravians, a very large number of Germans came to Pennsylvania from the Palatinate, from Würtemberg, Darmstadt and other parts of Germany. This colony was long des-

* That these churches have dwindled away to almost nothing, would seem to appear from the fact that when their present amiable rector, the Rev. J. C. Clay, was elected, Dec. 5th, 1831, the entire number of votes given, was, at the Wicaco church (Philadelphia) 16, at Upper Merion 29, and at Kingessing 37. (Clay’s Annals, p. 133.)

† Colonial Records, vol. iii. p. 18.

titute of a regular ministry; there were however some schoolmasters and others, some of whom were probably good men, who undertook to preach; and as many of the emigrants brought with them the spirit of true piety from Germany, they brought also many devotional books and often read Arndt's *True Christianity* and other similar works for mutual edification.* For twelve years, from 1730 till the arrival of the patriarch of American Lutheranism, Dr. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the Swedish ministers kindly laboured among the Germans, as far as their duties to their own churches admitted. But before we pursue the history of this colony any farther, our attention is claimed by

“The fourth settlement of Lutherans in this country, who established themselves in Georgia, in 1733, and to designate the gratitude of their hearts to the God who had protected them, styled their location *Ebenezer*. These emigrants were from *Saltzburg*, formerly belonging to *Bavaria*, and restored to the *Austrian dominions* at the peace of 1814. Persecuted at home by those enemies of all righteousness, the *Jesuits*.† and by *Romish priests* and *Romish rulers*, this band of disciples sought a resting place in these western wilds, where they could worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, under their own vine and fig tree, without molestation or fear. Through the instrumentality of *Rev. Mr. Urlsperger*, of *Augsburg*, who was a corresponding member of the *British Society for the Promotion of Christianity*, pecuniary aid was afforded by that liberal and noble-minded association, and the oppressed *Saltzburgers* were enabled to reach the place of their destination. Happily, they were immediately supplied by two able and faithful pastors, *Messrs. Bolzius* and *Gronau*. The latter was taken away by death after twelve years' labour among the emigrants, but *Bolzius* was spared to the church about thirty years. In 1738 these colonists erected an orphan-house at *Ebenezer*, to which work of benevolence important aid was contributed by that distinguished man of God, *George Whitefield*, who also furnished the bell for one of the churches erected by them. The descendants of these colonists are still numerous, and are connected with the *Lutheran Synod of South Carolina* and adjacent states.

“Soon after the above colonization, numerous Germans coming from *Pennsylvania* and other states, settled in *North Carolina*,‡ who enjoyed the labours of many excellent servants of Christ, *Nussman*,

* See *Hallische Nachrichten*, p. 665.

† *Heinsius' unparteiische Kirchenhistorie*, vol. iii. p. 291.

‡ *Shober's Luther*, p. 137.

Arndt, Storch, Roschen, Bernhard, Shober and others, and whose descendants constitute the present numerous churches in the Carolinas.

“In 1735 a settlement of Lutherans was formed in Spottsylvania, as Virginia was then sometimes called,* which we suppose to be the church in Madison county of that state. Their pastor, the Rev. Mr. Stoever, visited Germany for aid, and, together with several assistants, obtained three thousand pounds, part of which was expended in the erection of a church, the purchase of a plantation and slaves to work it for the support of their minister, and the balance expended for a library, or consumed by the expenses of the town.* As might have been expected, this church seems never to have enjoyed the smiles of our Father in heaven.

“In 1739 a few Germans emigrated to Waldoborough, Maine, to whose number an addition of 1500 souls was made thirteen years afterwards. But the title to the land given them by General Waldo proving unsound, many left the colony, and its numbers have never greatly increased. For many years they enjoyed the pastoral labours, successively of Rev. Messrs. Schaeffer (from 1762), Croner (from 1785), and Ritz, and since 1811 are under the charge of Rev. Mr. Starman.†

“Of all these colonies, that which in the providence of God has most increased, and has hitherto constituted the great body of the Lutheran Church in this country, is that in the Middle States, Pennsylvania, interior New York, Maryland, &c., whose history was traced in its proper place till 1742. This was a memorable year for the Lutheran Church. It was rendered so by the arrival of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, whose high intellectual and moral qualifications, whose indefatigable zeal and long life of arduous and enlightened labour for the Master’s cause, constitute a new era in the history of our American Zion, and justly entitle him to the appellation of patriarch of the American Lutheran Church. There had indeed been Lutherans in Pennsylvania sixty years earlier. There had been churches built at New Hanover, and near Lebanon (the Bergkirche) where the Rev. Mr. Stoever laboured in 1733, and at York in 1734. In Philadelphia also the Lutherans had worshipped jointly with their Reformed brethren in an old log house in Arch Street. But in general they had enjoyed no regular ministry, until 1742. Muhlenberg came to this country

* Hallische Nachrichten, p. 331.

† Heinsius speaks of a colony of Swiss Lutherans, who, tired of Romish oppression, also sought refuge in this western world. They came by way of England, under the direction of Col. Pury, who established them in a place called after himself Puryburg. This colony, if we mistake not, was in South Carolina, but we have not been able to find any account of its progress or present condition. (Heinsius’ Kirchengeschichte, vol. iii. page 291.)

with qualifications of the highest order. His education was of the very first character. In addition to his knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, he spoke English, German, Hollandish, French, Latin, and Swedish. But what was still more important, he was educated in the school of Francke, and had imbibed a large portion of his heavenly spirit. Like Paul, he had an ardent zeal for the salvation of 'his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh.' He first landed in Georgia, and spent a week with the brethren Bolzius and Gronau, to refresh his spirit and learn the circumstances of the country; and then pursuing his course by a dangerous coasting voyage, in a small and insecure sloop,* which had no accommodations for passengers, he arrived in Philadelphia, Nov. 25, 1742. Having reached his place of destination, and surmounted the opposition of Count Zinzendorf, who, under the assumed name of Thurnstein, had passed himself off as a Lutheran minister and inspector,† he was cordially received, and entered on his labours with comprehensive and well-directed views for the benefit of the whole church. He continued to labour for near half a century, with indefatigable zeal. Whilst Edwards was co-operating with the extraordinary outpourings of God's spirit in New England, and the Wesleys were labouring to revive vital godliness in England; whilst Whitefield was doing the same work in England and America, and the successors of Francke were labouring to evangelize Germany: Muhlenberg was striving with similar zeal and fidelity to do the work of God among his German brethren in this western world. Of him, as also of some of his earliest associates, it may be truly said, that 'he was in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by his own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness, and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, and in cold and nakedness.' He preached in season and out of season, in churches, in dwellings, in barns, and in the open air, until at last that divine Master, whom he so faithfully served, received

* During this voyage all on board endured many privations; and being delayed and tossed about by contrary winds, suffered much for want of water. So great was the destitution of water, that even the rats ate out the stoppers of the vinegar bottles, and by inserting their tails, extracted the cooling liquid, and drew them through their mouths. And some of these animals were also seen licking the perspiration from the foreheads of the sleeping mariners. (Hallische Nachrichten, p. 9.)

† The writer has in his library a volume of sermons, published in Budingen, 1746, evidently by Count Zinzendorf, the title page of which represents their author to have been Lutheran Inspector and Pastor in Philadelphia in 1742.

him into the society of the apostles and prophets at his right hand, October 7th, 1787.*

“Such was Muhlenberg. Throughout his long life he was regarded by all as the leader of the Lutheran phalanx, as the father of the Lutheran Church in this country. Although we see no necessity for attaching a season of grateful acknowledgment of the divine goodness, to any specific date, as it is at all times proper; yet if such a date be sought, no one more appropriate could be found than the year of Muhlenberg’s call to this work, (September, 1741,) or his actual arrival in this country in 1742.

“Muhlenberg was soon joined in the American field by other highly respectable men, of excellent education and of spirit like his own; the greater part of whom were in like manner sent from Germany, such as Brunnholtz and Lemke, 1745; Handshuh, Hartwick, the generous founder of the seminary that bears his name, and Weygand, 1748; Heinzelman and Schultz, 1751; Gerock, Hausil, Wortman, Wagner, Schartlin, Shrenk, and Rauss, 1753; Bager, 1758; Voigt and Krug, 1764; Helmuth and Schmidt, 1769; and Kunze, 1770. In company with Mr. Brunnholtz came also Messrs. N. Kurtz and Schaum, who were ordained in 1748 and were among the most faithful and useful of our ministers. The former was the father of the venerable servant of Christ whom we are permitted this morning to welcome in our midst, the oldest Lutheran minister in the United States, bereft of late of the partner of his life, himself yet kindly spared amongst us as a relic of a former generation. The increase of ministers was slow. When the first synod was held, in 1748, there were only eleven regular Lutheran ministers in the United States.† Three years after that time the number of congregations was rated at about 40, and the Lutheran population in America at 60,000.

“The greater part of these men were indefatigable in their labours. Numerous and arduous were the difficulties in their way. The population was unsettled, ever tending farther into the interior;‡ intemperance had already made sad havoc in the land; the semi-civilized habits so natural to pioneers in colonization, the various frolics, the celebrations in honour of Tammany, the Indian chief, &c., which were then extensively observed, were formidable obstacles to religion. Inadequate ministerial support; difficulty of travelling from want of

* Schmucker’s Retrospect, pp. 9–11.

† In 1743, Naessemann, the Swedish minister, reported to Sweden, that there were at that time twenty German Lutheran congregations in America. (Heinsius, iii. p. 637.)

‡ Muhlenberg states that in five years half his congregation had changed.

roads in many directions; and not unfrequently the tomahawk and scalping-knife of the Indian impeded their progress. I cannot stop to tell the soul-stirring story of many an Indian massacre. A single instance, from the pen of Father Muhlenberg himself, may teach us alike to appreciate the security of our worship and the bitter cost at which our fathers provided it; may teach us that we are reaping the fruits of their sweat and blood. The case was that of a man whose two grown daughters had attended a course of instruction by Mr. Muhlenberg, and been solemnly admitted by confirmation to the communion of the church. This man afterwards went with his family some distance into the interior to a tract of land which he purchased. When the war with the Indians broke out, he removed his family to their former residence, and occasionally returned to his farm to attend to his grain and cattle. On one occasion he went accompanied by his two daughters to spend a few days there, and bring away some wheat. On Friday evening, after the wagon had been loaded, and every thing was ready for their return on the morrow, his daughters complained that they felt anxious and dejected, and were impressed with the idea that they were soon to die. They requested their father to unite with them in singing the familiar German funeral hymn: 'Who knows how near my end may be?*' after which they commended themselves to God in prayer and retired to rest. The light of the succeeding morning beamed upon them, and all was yet well. Whilst the daughters were attending to the dairy, cheered with the joyful hope of soon greeting their friends, and being out of danger, the father went to the field for the horses, to prepare for their departure home. As he was passing through the field, suddenly he saw two Indians, armed with rifles, tomahawks, and scalping-knives, rushing towards him at full speed. The sight so terrified him, that he lost all self-command, and stood motionless and silent. When they were about twenty yards from him, he suddenly, and with all his strength, exclaimed, "Lord Jesus, living and dying I am thine." Scarcely had the Indians heard the words 'Lord Jesus,' (which they probably knew as the white man's name of the 'Great Spirit,') when they stopped short, and uttered a hideous yell. The man ran with almost supernatural strength into the dense forest, and by taking a serpentine course the Indians lost sight of him and relinquished the pursuit. He hastened to an adjoining farm, where two German families resided, for assistance. But on approaching near it, he heard the dying groans of the families, who were falling beneath

* The well-known German hymn, "Wer weiss wie nahe mir mein Ende."

the murderous tomahawk of some other Indians. Having providentially not been observed by them, he hastened back to learn the fate of his daughters. But, alas! on coming within sight, he found his house and barn enveloped in flames! Finding that the Indians had possession here too, he hastened to another adjoining farm for help. Returning armed, with several men, he found the house reduced to ashes, and the Indians gone! His eldest daughter had been almost entirely burnt up, a few remains only of her body being found! And awful to relate, the younger, though the scalp had been cut from her head, and her body was horribly mangled from head to foot with the tomahawk, was yet living! 'The poor worm,' says Muhlenberg, 'was yet able to state all the circumstances of the dreadful scene.' After having done so, she requested her father to stoop down to her that she might give him a parting kiss and then go to her dear Saviour; and after she had impressed her dying lips upon his cheek, she yielded her spirit into the hands of that Redeemer,* who, though his judgments are often unsearchable and his ways past finding out, has nevertheless said, 'I am the resurrection and the life, if any man believe in me, though he die yet shall he live.' †

The interests of the Lutheran Church shared alike with those of other religious denominations and with the country generally in the disastrous influences of the American revolution, as well as in the happy results that have followed the triumph which the spirit of patriotism and liberty then achieved. "Many of the churches were destroyed throughout the land, and especially in New England. Zion Church, the largest in Philadelphia, was occupied as a hospital by the British army in 1778, and the congregation for a season wholly expelled. And their other church, St. Michael's, which had been built in 1743, the year after Muhlenburg's arrival, was used by the enemy as a garrison church, half of every Lord's day, the congregation having the use of it in the afternoon." ‡

"In 1786, the Lutheran ministry in the Middle States numbered 24. From that time until 1820, the year of the formation of their General Synod, the number of congregations and ministers was much in-

* Hallish. Nachr. p. 1007-8. The case here narrated was neither extreme nor rare. The elder Mr. Kurtz on the 2d of July, 1757, states that on that day the lifeless bodies of no less than seven members of his congregation were brought to the church for burial, they having been murdered by the Indians the evening before. Being anxious to improve this solemn scene to the spiritual welfare of his hearers, Mr. Kurtz deferred the interment until the succeeding day, and suffered the mangled bodies to remain in the church until the congregation convened; a pleasing evidence this, of his solicitude for souls.

† Schmucker's Retrospect, pp. 11-13.

‡ Ibid., p. 15.

creased, but owing to the want of a suitable institution for their education, and to other causes, the proportion of men destitute of a learned education was also augmented.”* From the influence of the revolution, and the war of 1812, as well as the wars in their mother country, from amid the baleful effects of which the German immigrants in this period came; from the temptations presented by the state of this country to pursue the accumulation of wealth, and consequently to neglect “the true riches:” our Lutheran brethren were now compelled to mourn in common with other denominations the low and declining state of piety in their churches. But towards the close of this period a manifest improvement in this respect began to cheer their hearts and illumine their prospects.

The year 1820 has been already mentioned as the date of the formation of the General Synod of the American Lutheran Church. “Prior to this era, the church had gradually become divided into five or six different, distant, and unconnected synods. Having no regular intercourse with each other, these several portions became more or less estranged, and lost all the advantages of mutual consultation, confidence and co-operation.”† The formation of the General Synod was the precursor of union and improvement, and the commencement of the most propitious era in their history. Much prejudice and hostility were encountered in the enterprise to institute this body; but by the prudence and kindness of its leaders, and particularly by the good fruits which were soon seen to result from it, these obstacles were overcome. The result was not accomplished, however, without a serious shock to the church, which occurred two years afterwards, in the recession of the largest and oldest of the district synods, that of Pennsylvania. This was the result of an ignorant clamour of “Union of Church and State,” which, in the case of those who had lately fled from this evil as it existed on the other side the Atlantic, is not marvellous; but which is not peculiar to this case. Protestants of other denominations in this country seem too ready, to raise against each other the same outcry, at every attempt among themselves for the promotion of their own denominational interests; while the open and exclusive efforts of Catholics, the sworn and inalienable devotees of a foreign despot, to keep themselves separate from all others, and to bend state funds and political influence to the accomplishment of this object, have scarcely, until of late, received a passing notice, except by here and there a solitary pen. But while the vital and indestructible distinction between Catholics and Protestants, the fruit of

* Schmucker's Retrospect, p. 16.

† Ibid. p. 18.

the Reformation, is thus boldly and tenaciously maintained by the former, the latter are too prone to treat the distinction as a mere nullity, as if its transfer to American soil could annihilate it.

The salutary influence of this general organization in the Lutheran Church was soon felt in every department of her interests. Some of the permanent benefits which have sprung from it are, the formation of a scriptural formula of government and discipline; a selection of psalmody of a higher order, both as to devotional sentiment and composition, than any previously used; a theological seminary and a college. The theological seminary was established in 1825, and went into operation the following year. Its beginning was feeble, but by the efforts of its faculty and friends, it has become a fountain of rich blessings to the church. Upwards of one hundred and fifty ministers have gone forth from this institution preaching the word. Its edifice, which is of brick, four stories in height, 100 feet in length, and 40 in breadth, and the dwellings of its professors, also of brick, are situated about a quarter of a mile from the village of Gettysburg, Pa., 114 miles from Philadelphia, 180 from Pittsburg, and 52 from Baltimore. Its faculty are the Rev. Samuel S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Didactic and Polemic, Homiletic and Pastoral Theology, and Chairman of the Faculty; Rev. Charles P. Krauth, D. D., Professor of Sacred Philology and Exegesis; Henry I. Smith, A. M., Professor of German Language and Literature. It has a library of upwards of 7,500 volumes, consisting of works of almost every age, language and size.*

"Pennsylvania College" is established and located at the same place, as an auxiliary to the Seminary, and "to promote liberal education among the descendants of Germans in the United States." It being found that some of the applicants for admission into the theological seminary were deficient in classical attainments, the board resolved, May 16, 1827, to establish a preparatory school, to be under their direction, and appointed Professor Schmucker and the Rev. John Herbst, to select a teacher, and carry their resolutions into effect. The Rev. D. Jacobs, A. M., was selected, and in June 1827, the school went into operation. From this humble beginning, it rose gradually in importance and influence. In 1829 it was changed into a gymnasium, and in 1831, the number of students had so much increased and its prospects become so flattering, that measures were adopted, chiefly through the exertions of Dr. Schmucker, to obtain a charter from the Legislature, erecting it into a college.† The institution was

* See Quarterly Register, and the Lutheran Almanac, 1842.

† See Lutheran Almanac, for 1842.

organized in July 1832, under the above title. It went into operation in October following. In the fall of 1834, it received a president, the Rev. C. P. Krauth, D. D., and subsequently the professorships were all filled by the successive election of Professors Baugher, Jacobs, Reynolds and Smith. So that the present faculty consists of the president, four professors, one lecturer on anatomy and physiology, and two tutors in the preparatory department. It has also a well selected library, to which annual accessions are made; besides the two libraries of the two literary societies and the German society. The number of students has annually increased, and by the report of 1840-41, their number was 157. In establishing the seminary and college, and in sustaining the General Synod, there was a noble band of co-workers engaged, including, at a later day, many of the alumni of the seminary itself. Among those who were contemporaneous with Dr. Schmucker, at the commencement of the seminary, and active in its establishment and support, deserve to be particularly named, the Rev. Dr. B. Kurtz, who made a successful tour through Germany, Denmark, &c., to collect funds and books for the institution. Dr. C. P. Krauth, Dr. D. F. Schaeffer, Rev. J. Herbst, Rev. B. Keller, Rev. J. Ruthrauf, Sr., and Dr. J. G. Schmucker of York.

It ought not to be overlooked, that from her earliest history the Lutheran Church has held learning in the greatest reverence, as the instrument of her emancipation from the thralldom of the dark ages. The Universities of Jena and Königsberg, Wittenberg and Leipzig, were among the first testimonials of her zeal in this respect. And had her early pastors in this country had the courage and the means for imitating their ancestors, and founded the institutions which now adorn and bless the American branch of this venerable portion of the church, her influence and success would have placed her now among the foremost of the "sacramental host." As it was, "in addition to their pastoral labours, several of the clergy occupied important posts in literary institutions." Dr. Kunze, of whom Dr. Miller of Princeton says, "his oriental learning has long rendered him an ornament of the American republic of letters," was German professor of the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew languages in the University of Pennsylvania, established in 1779. In 1785, Dr. Helmuth was appointed to the same station. And they were confessedly as learned men as any connected with the institution.* In the same year "Messrs. Helmuth and Schmidt, then pastors in Philadelphia, commenced a private seminary, and for twenty years continued, so far as their numerous

* Retrospect, p. 16.

pastoral duties would permit, to instruct candidates for the Lutheran ministry; but old age, and eventually death also, terminated these efforts.”* In 1787, the Legislature, out of gratitude for the revolutionary services of the Germans, and respect for their industry and excellence as citizens, endowed a college in Lancaster for their special benefit, to be for ever under their control. Of this institution, Dr. Muhlenberg, then pastor in Lancaster, was chosen president. And in 1791, the same body passed an act appropriating 5000 acres of land to the flourishing free school of the Lutheran Church in Philadelphia, in which, at that time, eighty poor children were receiving gratuitous education.†

An incident illustrative of German integrity is connected with the early history of their Philadelphia churches, and is worthy of notice. A debt due by the church to several mechanics was paid by the trustees in continental money at the time when that currency was good and at par value. Not long after, however, it depreciated and became nearly worthless; when without any obligation legal or moral, but merely that no one should be a loser through their instrumentality, they repaid the debt in specie. It is also an interesting fact, that in the same church, as early as 1804, a flourishing Sabbath school, numbering two hundred scholars, with forty teachers, was in active operation; showing that religion was then prospering among them.

In addition to the Seminary and College at Gettysburg, there is also a Literary and Theological Institute at Columbus, within the bounds of the Ohio Synod; another at East Hartwick, Otsego county, N. Y., and another in the village of Lexington, South Carolina, under the charge of the Rev. Dr. Hazelius, and under the patronage of the Synods of North and South Carolina. All these institutions have for their object, the preparation of candidates for the holy ministry, and are all free from debt and flourishing, though not independent of the aid of the churches. There is also an institution for the education of poor orphan children, called the “Emmaus Institute,” located at Middletown, Dauphin Co., Pa., and liberally endowed by Mr. George Fry; but the funds have, until lately, been unavoidably and greatly diminished by unfaithful managers and pretended heirs.

In the Lutheran Almanacs for 1842 and 1843, we have the following summary of statistics of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, viz.: 424 ministers of the gospel; 1,371 congregations; 146,300 communicants; 18,000 scattered members (estimated); 1 General Synod, and 19 District Synods. Under their care are 4

* Schmucker's Retrospect, p. 23.

† Ibid. p. 16.

Theological Seminaries; 1 College; 4 Classical Schools; 1 Orphan-house; a Parent Education Society; a Foreign Missionary Society, and a Book Establishment.*

We have only space for a passing notice of the Parent Education Society. It was formed in 1835, by a convention of ministers and laymen at York, Pa. They seem to have assembled and acted with great unanimity and definiteness of purpose, as their session continued but two days, in which time a constitution was adopted, and the necessary officers elected. The total receipts from its formation to March 1, 1842, (seven and a half years,) amounted to upwards of \$21,200. The number of its beneficiaries to May 1, 1842, was 120; of whom 35 are now in different stages of their preparatory course; 38 have entered on their work; 16 have withdrawn, several of whom are still aided by congregations; 10 discontinued as incompetent; and 6 have terminated their mortal pilgrimage.†

From the Lutheran Almanac of 1843, we add the following statistics, which, though carefully collected, are necessarily imperfect.

STATISTICS.

SYNODS.	Minis.	Cong.	Baptis.	Comm.	Confir.	Sunday School.	Year of Report.
Synod of Pennsylvania and the adjacent States,	63	234	4451	30251	2597	69	1841
Synod of West Pennsylvania, .	58	195	4329	17219	2011	100	1841
Synod of New York,	38	47	1473	6668	400	34	1841
Hartwick Synod,	16	27	373	4354	318	30	1841
Synod of Maryland,	27	59	898	6557	393	33	1841
Eastern District Synod of Ohio,	14	89	932	10500	471	8	1841
Western District Synod of Ohio,	26	118	1589	10288	776	24	1841
English Synod of Ohio,	7	25	253	1842	184	6	1841
Synod of North Carolina, . .	14	38	365	2613	150	10	1841
Synod of South Carolina, . .	28	37	328	2143	154	16	1841
English Synod of Ohio and adjacent States,	24	80	706	4770	521	23	1841
Synod of Virginia,	17	31	180	1771	209		1841
Franckean Synod,	25	37	300	1868	280	20	1841
Synod of the West,	21	41	453	2622	268	15	1841
Synod of South Western Virginia,	6	15	38	778	58		1841
Synod of East Pennsylvania, .	9	18	178	2114	185	15	1842
Synod of Indiana,	9	20	164	1050	83		1841
Synod of Tennessee,	16	80	176	4000	154		1841
Alleghany Synod, org. 1842, 1st meeting in Sept., 1842.							
Vacant congregations,		180		9000			1842
Scattered members, principally in the Western States,				25000			1842

* Of these, about one-third are found in the State of Pennsylvania, where in 1840, they numbered 328 churches, 36,516 communicants, and 111 ministers, of whom 64 were connected with the East Synod, and 40 with the West Synod of that State, and 7 with the Synod of Ohio.

† Quarterly Register.

GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE.

This was a subject over which the early Reformers could exert little or no influence. Their efforts in breaking the shackles of spiritual despotism, could not change the political constitutions by which the Church and the State were joined together for mutual accommodation. Like all the other established churches of Europe, therefore, the Lutheran was prevented from adopting her scriptural and independent system of discipline. The consequence has been, that in the different kingdoms and provinces of Europe, their systems of ecclesiastical government are very various and inefficient; in no section retaining strictly the principle of ministerial parity, with perfect freedom from state control. On their arrival in this country, that impediment no longer obstructed their zeal for improvement in ecclesiastical government and discipline. "They at once adopted the form which Luther and the Lutheran divines generally have always regarded as the primitive one, viz.: the parity of ministers, the co-operation of the laity in church government, and the free voluntary convention of synods." Such was the character of the first synod held in Philadelphia in 1748, six years after the arrival of Muhlenberg. It was composed of a due proportion of lay delegates, who took an equal part with the clergy in the transaction of business. The laity were also united in the calling of ministers. An instance illustrative of this occurred in 1748, on the occasion of the settlement of the Rev. Nicholas Kurtz. "After his examination by Messrs. Muhlenberg, Brunnholtz, Handschuh, and Hartwick, we are told, the elders and deacons of the church in which he had laboured as a licentiate, were called on to sign his vocation."

Speaking of a synod held in 1760, at New Providence, a village then the place of his residence, and now called Trap, after the Rev. Mr. Gerock had preached a German sermon in the forenoon, and the excellent Provost Wrangel of the Swedish Church, an English discourse in the afternoon, Muhlenberg says: "After the close of public worship all the ministers convened at my house, and held a biblical colloquy (*colloquium biblicum*) on the essential characteristics of genuine repentance, faith, and godliness; in which they endeavoured to benefit each other according to the grace given them, by communicating the results of their own experience and self-examination, so that it was a cheering and delightful season. The residue of the evening was spent in singing spiritual hymns and psalms and in conversation about the spiritual condition of our churches; and so short did the time appear, that it was three o'clock in the morning before

we retired to rest. Oh, (he adds) how delightful it is when ministers, standing aloof from all political and party contests, seek to please their Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and have at heart the welfare of their churches and the souls entrusted to their care; and are willing rather to suffer reproach with the people of God, than choose the treasures of Egypt.”*

In the discipline of the church, Muhlenberg adopted virtually the Congregational mode; calling on the members to vote in the case of restoring a penitent offender, after a public acknowledgment or confession. And the most rigid and scriptural course was adopted and pursued for maintaining the purity of the church. Public excommunication was administered to the immoral, and the most scrupulous precautions were observed to prevent their intrusion within its hallowed precincts. “In 1772, Helmuth, in order more effectually to prevent the approach of unworthy members, introduced the practice of requiring all who desired to commune, to communicate their names to him beforehand. The register of names was read before the congregation, and those of immoral members publicly erased.” In the Lancaster church, and in the church of Philadelphia, as early as 1663, power was given to the pastors to reject all immoral members from the sacramental table. With the advance of her other interests, the American Lutheran Church has continued to foster and defend this vital part of her system. In describing its present state, Professor Schmucker says, “The government and discipline of each individual church is essentially like that of our Presbyterian brethren. Our synods also, in structure and powers, most resemble their presbyteries, having fewer formalities in their proceedings, and frequently couching their decisions in the form of recommendations. Our General Synod is wholly an advisory body, resembling the associations of the Congregational churches in New England. In addition to these regular ecclesiastical bodies, constituting our system of government, we have special conferences for the purpose of holding stated protracted meetings. These are subdivisions of synods, containing ordinarily from five to ten ministers each, who are annually to hold several protracted meetings within the bounds of their district. The chief object of these meetings is to awaken and convert sinners, and to edify believers by close practical preaching. This feature mainly resembles the quarterly meetings of our Methodist brethren, and presents to pious and zealous ministers who are thirsting for the salvation of souls, the most direct opportunity they can desire to

* Hall. Nach. p. 855.

glorify God and advance his scriptural kingdom. Yet all these meetings are to be conducted as the scriptures enjoin, 'decently and in order.' This system of government is not yet adopted by all our synods; yet its general features, with perhaps a greater admixture of Congregationalism, substantially pervade those synods also which have not yet united with the General Synod."*

DOCTRINAL VIEWS.

At the commencement of the Reformation, all Protestants, as has been stated, were called Lutherans by the Papists, in contempt and derision; but subsequently they adopted and gloried in the title, because Luther was the great leader in that work. Afterwards, as other reformers arose, their followers were called the Reformed, in distinction from the immediate followers of Luther. This name was first adopted in France, as early as 1521. The distinction, however, was afterwards connected with a difference in sentiment respecting the presence of Christ's material body in the sacramental elements, and on some minor points; those who adopted Luther's peculiar views were called Lutherans, and all other Protestants, "the Reformed." There has been a difference of opinion among different writers respecting Luther's doctrinal views, some maintaining that he lived and died firm in the Augustinian or Calvinistic faith, (excepting on the eucharist,)+ others affirming that his views on the distinguishing doctrines, set forth by the Acts of the Synod of Dort, were always unadjusted and inconsistent with each other, and that long before he died, he preached the sentiments on these points which his successor Melancthon and his followers since have held. All agree, however, that in the beginning Luther's views on predestination and other kindred doctrines were fully Augustinian. There has also been a difference of representation with regard to Luther's views respecting the corporeal presence in the eucharist; some contending that the language of the Lutheran symbols on that subject, viz.: "That the body and blood of Christ are actually present under the form or emblems of bread and wine, and dispensed to the communicants," (Augsburg Confession, German, Art. 10,) means the *real* presence, or consubstantiation. Others, and especially our American

* Quarterly Register. This Formula of Government and Discipline may be found annexed to the English Hymn Book of the General Synod, as also to the Popular Theology of Dr. Schmucker, by whom (excepting the latter part, relating to the General Synod) it was composed.

† See Hawe's Church Hist., vol. ii.

Lutheran brethren, maintain that this language is not stronger than that employed on the same subject by Calvin, Cranmer, Ridley, and other English reformers, whose meaning nevertheless has always been admitted to be a *spiritual* presence only. But whatever was the precise meaning of those who formed the "Symbols" of the Lutheran Church, it is not denied that "she did entertain opinions on this topic different from the other churches," and at least spoke unintelligibly when she taught the spiritual presence of a *material* body. And on this point, among others, our American Lutheran brethren profess to have made an improvement corresponding with their American character generally. It should therefore be distinctly understood, that the American Lutheran Church *no longer requires of her members assent to the doctrine of the real presence of the Saviour in the eucharist.** Indeed, leniency in respect to human creeds, is one of her present general features. She rejects the authority of the Fathers in ecclesiastical controversy, to which the Reformers injudiciously appealed, and fully adopts the principle that the Bible alone should be the standard of faith, and the umpire in all religious discussions. On this point, Professor Schmucker, our guide in this synopsis, has the following remarks:

"It is the practice of the Lutheran Church in this country not to bind her ministers to the *minutiæ* of any human creed. The Bible, and the belief that the *fundamental doctrines* of the Bible are taught in a manner substantially correct in the Augsburg Confession, is all that is required. On the one hand, we regard it as certain, that if we would be faithful to the injunction 'not to receive any who come to us bringing another doctrine,' an examination of applicants for admission among us is indispensable. Such an examination is virtually a requisition of their creed, that we may compare it with our own. Now whether the articles to which we require their assent be few or many, be written or oral, they are a creed; and obviously its reduction to paper presents some material facilities in the examination. A written creed therefore seems necessary to the purity of the church. On the other hand, history informs us that for several hundred years after the days of the apostles, no other creed was used in the whole church than that called the Apostles' Creed, because admitted by all to contain the principal doctrines taught by the apostles. This creed embodied only the cardinal doctrines of the gospel, which all the so called orthodox denominations of the present

* Portraiture, p. 40.

day do actually believe; and yet the assent to these few doctrines did, for centuries after the apostolic age, secure admission to any and every part of the universal church on earth." "The duty of all parts of the Christian church seems to be to return to the use of shorter doctrinal creeds as tests of ecclesiastical, ministerial, and sacramental communion. This noble course the Lutheran Church has already virtually taken, by requiring assent only to the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, together with an approval of our principles of government and worship."*

This extract may serve to show the polity of our Lutheran brethren on this point. As our object is simply to present a condensed view of American Lutheranism from their own standard authorities, we have no space for comments on any part of the system.

The reader ought not to suppose, however, that, because the Lutheran Church has adopted the leading principle already stated, she has no regard to those other formularies of doctrine which her founders prepared, and maintained as of vital importance in their day. "There are indeed," says Dr. Mosheim,† "certain formularies adopted by this church, which contain the principal points of its doctrine, ranged, for the sake of method and perspicuity, in their natural order. But these books have no authority but what they derive from the scriptures of truth, whose sense and meaning they are designed to convey." "The principal books," says Professor Schmucker, "here referred to as subsidiary to the Bible, were of two classes; first, the confessions of the primitive centuries, the so called Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Confession, by which the Lutheran Church established her identity with the church of the apostolic and succeeding ages; and secondly, the Augsburg Confession; the Apology or Defence of this confession; the Smalcald Articles by Luther, and also his Catechisms."‡

The following are the leading doctrines of the Lutheran Church, as set forth in the Augsburg Confession, and adopted by the whole body of Lutherans in this country:

1. "That there is one divine essence, which is called, and is God, eternal, incorporeal, indivisible, infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness; and yet that there are three persons who are of the same essence and power, and are co-eternal: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."

2. "That the Word, that is the Son of God, assumed human

* *Portraiture*, pp. 55, 56.

† *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. iii, p. 208.

‡ *Portraiture*, p. 20.

nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that the two natures, human and divine, inseparably united into one person, constitute one Christ, who is true God and man."

3. "That since the fall of Adam all men, who are naturally engendered, are born with a depraved nature, that is, without the fear of God, or confidence towards him, but with sinful propensities."

4. "That the Son of God truly suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried, that he might reconcile the Father to us, and be a *sacrifice* not only for original sin, but also for all the actual sins of men. That he also sanctifies those who believe in him, by sending into their hearts the Holy Spirit, who governs, consoles, quickens, and defends them against the devil and the power of sin."

5. "That men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works; but that they are justified gratuitously, for Christ's sake through faith."

6. "That this faith must bring forth good fruits; and that it is our duty to perform those good works which God commanded, because he has enjoined them, and not in the expectation of thereby meriting justification before him."

7. "That in order that we may obtain this faith the ministerial office has been instituted, whose members are to preach the gospel, and administer the sacraments (viz. Baptism and the Lord's Supper). For through the instrumentality of the word and sacraments as means of grace, the Holy Spirit is given, who in his own time and place, produces faith in those who hear the gospel message, viz. that God for Christ's sake, and not on account of any merit in us, justifies those who believe in Christ."

8. "That at the end of the world Christ will appear for judgment; that he will raise all the dead; that he will give to the pious and elect eternal life and endless joys, but will condemn wicked men and devils to be punished without end."

FORMS OF WORSHIP AND CHURCH ORDER.

In her rites of worship the Lutheran Church in Europe employs *liturgies*, "differing in minor points, but agreeing in essentials," similar to those of the Protestant Episcopal Church, except in extension, being not more than one third as long. In this country, a short uniform liturgy has been adopted, the use of which, however, is left to the option and discretion of each minister, as "he may deem most conducive to edification."

The festivals of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, the Ascension,

and Whitsunday, are retained and observed in the Lutheran Church as commemorative of the "fundamental facts of the Christian religion," and for the purpose of leading her clergy to preach annually on the events which they severally represent.

She also maintains the institution of infant church membership and baptism, and in connexion with it, the rite of confirmation. And, as from the beginning, so now, she extends her parental care and vigilance over the religious education of her baptized children. "It is regarded as the duty of every minister occasionally to convene the children of each congregation for instruction in the catechism. Annually, also, and if necessary oftener, the minister holds a series of meetings with those who are applicants for admission to sacramental communion, or, as in reference to the infant baptism of the applicant, it is called confirmation, and for all who feel a concern for their salvation." "Every succeeding meeting is occupied in conversational lectures on experimental religion, and in examination of the catechumens on the fundamental doctrines and duties of religion, as contained in the Bible and Luther's Catechism." "At the close of these meetings, which are continued through from six to twelve weeks, once or twice each week, and in the last, if convenient, daily, the church council are convened to examine the catechumens on their qualifications for sacramental communion." "Although in the hands of an unconverted minister, this duty, like all others, will be mere formality, and attended with little profit, yet we have never met, nor do we expect to meet, a pious minister, who faithfully practised this system, who did not regard it as a most blessed and successful method of bringing souls to Christ."*

It is not surprising that the earliest reformers should be slow to abolish every vestige and form of Romanism to which they had been so long and so zealously attached. Luther, after he had begun to see the extent of its corruptions, and to expose them, did not at once tear himself away from the church in which he had been nurtured, but suffered long and much before he renounced the jurisdiction of the Pontiff. His immediate followers also retained for several years many of their ancient superstitions, as exorcism in baptism, the wafer in the Lord's Supper, and private confession. These, however, especially in the United States, have been expurgated even in form, from the Lutheran Church. The last mentioned, (private confession,) it ought to be observed, as retained by the Lutherans, had no affinity to the vile principles and practice of the Romish confessional, viz.: that to

* Portraiture, page 31.

the priest, as to God's vicegerent, all the secret thoughts and feelings, as well as actions, must be detailed, in order to obtain pardon; and that the priest has power to dispense such pardon. But the Reformers had established what they deemed a necessary custom preparatory to communion, that of a private interview between the pastor and each communicant, in which the latter gave an account of his religious experience, trials, hopes, &c., for the purpose of receiving such counsel and instruction as his peculiar state of mind and heart might require. This practice they injudiciously denominated *confession*. "But even this custom has been almost entirely abandoned in this country, and the preparation for communion consists in a public preparatory discourse, public and united confession of sins, and rehearsal of the promises of divine mercy; similar to the preparatory exercises of other churches; except, that, as in the Episcopal Church, they are generally conducted according to a form."

Respecting the *order of the church*, Dr. Mosheim says, "The government of the Lutheran Church seems equally removed from Episcopacy on the one hand, and from Presbyterianism on the other, if we except the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark, which retain the form of ecclesiastical government that preceded the Reformation, purged indeed from the superstitions and abuses that rendered it so odious." Dr. Maclaine (the translator) adds, "The Archbishop of Upsal is primate of Sweden, and the only archbishop among the Lutherans;" and his "revenues do not amount to more than £400 yearly, while those of the bishops are proportionably small."*

Yet even in those kingdoms where the Lutheran is the established church, and where she retains nominal bishops, she discards, as she ever has done, the "divine right" of ministerial imparity as anti-scriptural; holding, with her great founder, and with all her standard writers, that in the primitive church the terms *bishop* and *presbyter* were but different names for the same office. Hence Luther himself, though merely a presbyter, was in the habit of ordaining ministers, and took a part in that ceremony, without the assistance of a prelate, only a few days previous to his death.† But the Reformers deemed it expedient, as promotive of order and harmony in the churches, to introduce some diversity and subordination among their clergy in rank and duty, under the titles *superintendents* and *seniors*, and in Sweden and Denmark, *bishops*. "In the United States," says Professor Schmucker, "entire parity is maintained, and even the nominal office of *Senior Ministerii* is retained by only one out of all our

* Eccl. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 211, 212.

† See Life of Luther by Justus Jonas.

synods." "Although our ministers are strenuous advocates of parity, they pretty extensively favour the idea of returning to the use of the word bishop in its scriptural sense, as applicable to every minister of the gospel; the sense in which, as Luke informs us, (Acts xx. 28,) instead of one bishop having oversight over a large district of country or diocese, there were several bishops in the one city Ephesus."

"In this country, the Lutheran Church, in common with her Protestant sister churches, deprecates, as unwarranted and dangerous, all interference of civil government in religious affairs, excepting the mere protection of all denominations and all individuals in the unrestricted right to worship in any and every way they think proper."*

The validity of Luther's ordination as a presbyter in the Church of Rome, has sometimes been questioned, because of the corruptions which destroyed her title to the standing of a Christian church. But when Luther received ordination from the hands of the Romish hierarchy, the corruptions which branded that church as Antichrist, had not been formally and officially adopted; nor were they, until enacted into the essential features of her system, and made integral parts of her prescribed formularies of faith by the Council of Trent, A. D. 1542. And when she excommunicated the Reformer, and thundered her anathemas against him, he had previously renounced her jurisdiction, by burning her standard works and the Bull of her Pontiff. His ordination, therefore, and that of all his Protestant successors, is as valid as that of the Romish priesthood at the beginning of the sixteenth century; i. e. he was ordained by ministers properly accredited at the time of its performance. With regard to the subject of ordination in general, our Lutheran brethren, in common with most other Protestants, understand the various Greek words employed by the sacred writers to express it, to mean simply *induction into office*—an *appointing* to the particular duties of the ministry by a prescribed form, to preserve the sacred office from indiscriminate and of course unworthy usurpation; utterly discarding the Romish superstition that by the "laying on of hands" some mystic influence is imparted by apostolic succession. They maintain, therefore, that as in the only three instances of ordination after the time of our Saviour, mentioned in the New Testament, the rite was performed not by *one* man, called a "diocesan bishop," but by *several* persons; [as that of Barnabas and Saul by Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen (Acts xiii. 3); that of the presbyters or elders of the churches in Iconium, Lystra, Antioch, &c., by Paul and Barnabas (Acts xiv. 23); and that of

* Quarterly Register.

Timothy by the hands of the eldership or presbytery (1 Tim. iv. 14);] and as in other cases, individual ministers, as Timothy and Titus, were directed to induct or appoint others: they regard ordination as valid when performed in either way, whether they who perform it be called bishops, presbyters, ministers, or pastors.* And in *cases of necessity*, they further maintain, that a minister may be set apart and constituted by the laity themselves. "As to the doctrine of Papal apostolic succession," Dr. Schmucker very justly remarks, "it is a mere figment, and can never be proved by the Papists themselves. To say nothing of their doctrine of *intention*, which, Cardinal Bellarmine himself asserts, renders doubtful the validity of every Romish sacrament, (*Bellarmin. Lib. Just. cap. 8.*) where was their Papal succession when Liberius, the occupant of the Holy See, professed Arianism, A. D. 357? Where was it in the fourteenth century, during the so called great western schism, from A. D. 1378 to 1414, when two different lines of contending Pontiffs reigned simultaneously, each having a portion of the church adhering to him; each excommunicating the other; and finally both deposed as heretical by the Council of Pisa, in 1409?"†

We have thus traced, in as brief and comprehensive a form as was consistent with our limits and the nature of the subject, the history, progress, and present state of the Lutheran Church, especially as planted on our own soil. To quote once more the language of her advocate, who has been our authority and guide in most of these statements: "She may be emphatically styled the Church of the Reformation. She holds the grand doctrines of Christianity with fewer appended peculiarities than most other denominations. With the Calvinist she holds the graciousness of salvation; with the Congregationalist she believes that Christ tasted death for every man; with the Methodist she approves of regularly recurring protracted meetings; with the Episcopalian she occasionally employs a liturgy and forms of prayer; with the German Reformed she agrees in the instruction and confirmation of catechumens; and with all she unites in ascribing all the glory of our privileges on earth and hopes in heaven, to that Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world."‡

In closing this sketch, we would congratulate our Lutheran brethren on the past and present indications that they share the smiles of Him who is King in Zion, and whose favour is life. In reviewing

* Portraiture of Lutheranism; Appendix, on Ordination.

† Portraiture, p. 17.

‡ Quarterly Register.

their history, and in contemplating their ecclesiastical features and character as presented among us, we have felt that fraternal spirit of Christian fellowship which the recognition of an ancient and devoted member of the great family of Protestant Christendom is fitted to awaken and inspire. Nor could we suppress the rising regret that so many of their contemporaries, in the land of their origin, had neglected to maintain and hold fast those vital principles of religious faith and that form of sound words, which their fathers so nobly and fearlessly espoused and defended.

It is interesting to notice amid the diversity of forms and the various shades of difference on minor points of religious sentiment, which mark the freedom of thought and opinion among Protestant denominations, that so large a proportion of them agree in the essential elements of "the truth as it is in Jesus." Although on the great doctrines of the *divine decrees*, the *nature of faith*, the *efficiency of grace*, the *believer's perseverance* in it, and the *sacraments* of the New Testament, some unessential difference of views have distinguished the Lutheran from the Calvinist: yet both agree that salvation is of grace alone, and that that grace is sovereign and omnipotent, through an atonement of infinite merit and sufficiency, received and applied by a faith that is of the operation of God, the fruit of his Spirit, all which is represented under the emblems employed in baptism and the Lord's Supper. The cardinal doctrine of the Reformation, *justification by faith alone*, they both wield, in opposition not only to the Popish doctrine of merit, but also to the native self-righteousness of the unchanged heart, to which the latter doctrine is adapted.

In this age of free inquiry, and of superficial views on the great and essential truths of revelation, when every form of wild conjecture and fanciful speculation is embodied into a theory, and finds numerous advocates and followers; and when, amidst it all, the "Man of Sin" is looking with renewed courage to this western continent and its heterogeneous population, as the last hope of his tottering throne: it is a matter of gratulation that we have here a remnant of that people who stood foremost in the contest which crippled his power at the maturity of its strength, and liberated mind and empire from his yoke of ignorance, superstition and oppression. May the spirit and zeal of Him whose name they bear, abide with them, and arm them to meet the arrogant demands of Papal Rome in this land of their adoption, as he did in the land of their ancestors. We particularly rejoice in that feature of their ecclesiastical system which provides for the culture of piety in the heart, and for the religious training of the young, particularly of their baptized children. On

this point, their example administers a just rebuke on the practice of too many Protestant churches, who with them profess the rite of household baptism, but treat it as a nullity. We trust that with this example before them, in connexion with the exclusiveness of the Romanists towards their children and adults in shutting them out from the light of truth: such churches will not only profess, but act upon the belief, that the baptismal covenant with children imposes upon the parents and the church the duty of their careful and constant religious training.

With her high estimate of the value and necessity of learning in her ministry, the early catechetical instruction of her children, and her strict regard to the vitals of Christian experience, the American Lutheran Church cannot fail to exert a high and holy influence in the cause of truth, and the religious welfare of our nation, and shine as a luminary of the first magnitude in the constellation of our American Zion. We bid her God-speed in her progress onward and upward, till the distinctions of earth are merged in the church of the First-born in heaven, and our mutual toils and conflicts terminated in one triumph, one song, and one everlasting rest.

LATTER DAY SAINTS.

BY JOSEPH SMITH,

NAUVOO, ILLINOIS.

THE Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, was founded upon direct revelation, as the true church of God has ever been, according to the scriptures (Amos, iii. 7, and Acts i. 2.) And through the will and blessings of God, I have been an instrument in his hands, thus far, to move forward the cause of Zion. Therefore, in order to fulfil the solicitation of your letter of July last, I shall commence with my life.

I was born in the town of Sharon, Windsor county, Vermont, on the 23d of December, A. D. 1805. When ten years old, my parents removed to Palmyra, New York, where we resided about four years, and from thence we removed to the town of Manchester, a distance of six miles.

My father was a farmer, and taught me the art of husbandry. When about fourteen years of age, I began to reflect upon the importance of being prepared for a future state; and upon inquiring the place of salvation, I found that there was a great clash in religious sentiment; if I went to one society they referred me to one place, and another to another; each one pointing to his own particular creed as the "sum-mum bonum" of perfection. Considering that all could not be right, and that God could not be the author of so much confusion, I determined to investigate the subject more fully, believing that if God had a church, it would not be split up into factions, and that if he taught one society to worship one way, and administer in one set of ordinances, he would not teach another principles which were diametrically opposed. Believing the word of God, I had confidence in the declaration of James, "If any man lack wisdom let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him."

I retired to a secret place in a grove, and began to call upon the

Lord. While fervently engaged in supplication, my mind was taken away from the objects with which I was surrounded, and I was enrapt in a heavenly vision, and saw two glorious personages, who exactly resembled each other in features and likeness, surrounded with a brilliant light, which eclipsed the sun at noonday. They told me that all the religious denominations were believing in incorrect doctrines, and that none of them was acknowledged of God as his church and kingdom. And I was expressly commanded to "go not after them," at the same time receiving a promise that the fulness of the gospel should at some future time be made known unto me.

On the evening of the 21st September, A. D. 1823, while I was praying unto God and endeavouring to exercise faith in the precious promises of scripture, on a sudden a light like that of day, only of a far purer and more glorious appearance and brightness, burst into the room; indeed the first sight was as though the house was filled with consuming fire. The appearance produced a shock that affected the whole body. In a moment a personage stood before me surrounded with a glory yet greater than that with which I was already surrounded. This messenger proclaimed himself to be an angel of God, sent to bring the joyful tidings, that the covenant which God made with ancient Israel was at hand to be fulfilled; that the preparatory work for the second coming of the Messiah was speedily to commence; that the time was at hand for the gospel in all its fulness to be preached in power, unto all nations, that a people might be prepared for the millennial reign.

I was informed that I was chosen to be an instrument in the hands of God to bring about some of his purposes in this glorious dispensation.

I was informed also concerning the aboriginal inhabitants of this country, and shown who they were, and from whence they came;—a brief sketch of their origin, progress, civilization, laws, governments, of their righteousness and iniquity, and the blessings of God being finally withdrawn from them as a people, was made known unto me. I was also told where there was deposited some plates, on which was engraven an abridgment of the records of the ancient prophets that had existed on this continent. The angel appeared to me three times the same night and unfolded the same things. After having received many visits from the angels of God, unfolding the majesty and glory of the events that should transpire in the last days, on the morning of the 22d of September, A. D. 1827, the angel of the Lord delivered the records into my hands.

These records were engraven on plates which had the appearance of gold; each plate was six inches wide and eight inches long, and

not quite so thick as common tin. They were filled with engravings in Egyptian characters, and bound together in a volume, as the leaves of a book, with three rings running through the whole. The volume was something near six inches in thickness, a part of which was sealed. The characters on the unsealed part were small and beautifully engraved. The whole book exhibited many marks of antiquity in its construction, and much skill in the art of engraving. With the records was found a curious instrument which the ancients called "Urim and Thummim," which consisted of two transparent stones set in the rim on a bow fastened to a breastplate.

Through the medium of the Urim and Thummim I translated the record, by the gift and power of God.

In this important and interesting book the history of ancient America is unfolded, from its first settlement by a colony that came from the tower of Babel, at the confusion of languages, to the beginning of the fifth century of the Christian era.

We are informed by these records, that America, in ancient times, has been inhabited by two distinct races of people. The first were called Jaredites, and came directly from the tower of Babel. The second race came directly from the city of Jerusalem, about six hundred years before Christ. They were principally Israelites, of the descendants of Joseph. The Jaredites were destroyed, about the time that the Israelites came from Jerusalem, who succeeded them in the inheritance of the country. The principal nation of the second race fell in battle towards the close of the fourth century. The remnant are the Indians who now inhabit this country. This book also tells us that our Saviour made his appearance upon this continent after his resurrection; that he planted the gospel here in all its fulness, and richness, and power, and blessing; that they had apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, and evangelists; the same order, the same priesthood, the same ordinances, gifts, powers, and blessing, as was enjoyed on the eastern continent; that the people were cut off in consequence of their transgressions; that the last of their prophets who existed among them was commanded to write an abridgment of their prophecies, history, &c., and to hide it up in the earth, and that it should come forth and be united with the Bible, for the accomplishment of the purposes of God, in the last days. For a more particular account, I would refer to the Book of Mormon, which can be purchased at Nauvoo, or from any of our travelling elders.

As soon as the news of this discovery was made known, false reports, misrepresentation and slander flew, as on the wings of the wind, in every direction; my house was frequently beset by mobs,

and evil designing persons; several times I was shot at, and very narrowly escaped, and every device was made use of to get the plates away from me; but the power and blessing of God attended me, and several began to believe my testimony.

On the 6th April, 1830, the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints," was first organized, in the town of Manchester, Ontario Co., State of New York. Some few were called and ordained by the Spirit of revelation and prophecy, and began to preach as the Spirit gave them utterance, and though weak, yet were they strengthened by the power of God; and many were brought to repentance, were immersed in the water, and were filled with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. They saw visions and prophesied, devils were cast out, and the sick healed by the laying on of hands. From that time the work rolled forth with astonishing rapidity, and churches were soon formed in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri; in the last named state a considerable settlement was formed in Jackson county; numbers joined the church, and we were increasing rapidly; we made large purchases of land, our farms teemed with plenty, and peace and happiness were enjoyed in our domestic circle and throughout our neighbourhood; but as we could not associate with our neighbours,—who were, many of them, of the basest of men, and had fled from the face of civilized society to the frontier country, to escape the hand of justice—in their midnight revels, their sabbath-breaking, horse-racing, and gambling, they commenced at first to ridicule, then to persecute, and finally an organized mob assembled and burned our houses, tarred and feathered and whipped many of our brethren, and finally drove them from their habitations; these, houseless and homeless, contrary to law, justice, and humanity, had to wander on the bleak prairies till the children left the tracks of their blood on the prairie. This took place in the month of November, and they had no other covering but the canopy of heaven, in that inclement season of the year. This proceeding was winked at by the government; and although we had warrantee deeds for our land, and had violated no law, we could obtain no redress. There were many sick who were thus inhumanly driven from their houses, and had to endure all this abuse, and to seek homes where they could be found. The result was, that a great many of them being deprived of the comforts of life, and the necessary attendance, died; many children were left orphans; wives, widows; and husbands, widowers. Our farms were taken possession of by the mob, many thousands of cattle, sheep, horses, and hogs were taken, and our household goods, store goods, and printing press and types were broken, taken, or otherwise destroyed.

Many of our brethren removed to Clay county, where they continued until 1836 (three years); there was no violence offered, but there were threatenings of violence. But in the summer of 1836 these threatenings began to assume a more serious aspect; from threats, public meetings were called, resolutions were passed, vengeance and destruction were threatened, and affairs again assumed a fearful attitude; Jackson county was a sufficient precedent, and as the authorities in that county did not interfere, they boasted that they would not in this; which on application to the authorities we found to be too true; and, after much violence, privation, and loss of property, we were again driven from our homes.

We next settled in Caldwell and Davies counties, where we made large and extensive settlements, thinking to free ourselves from the power of oppression by settling in new counties, with a very few inhabitants in them; but here we were not allowed to live in peace; and in 1838 were again attacked by mobs; an exterminating order was issued by Governor Boggs, and under the sanction of law, an organized banditti ravaged the country, robbing us of our cattle, sheep, horses, hogs, &c.; many of our people were murdered in cold blood, the chastity of our women was violated, and we were forced to sign away our property at the point of the sword; and after enduring every indignity that could be heaped upon us by an inhuman, ungodly band of marauders,—from twelve to fifteen thousand souls, men, women, and children, were driven from their own firesides, and from lands for which they had warrantee deeds, to wander houseless, friendless, and homeless, (in the depth of winter,) as exiles on the earth, or to seek an asylum in a more genial clime, and among a less barbarous people.

Many sickened and died in consequence of the cold and hardships they had to endure, many wives were left widows, and children orphans and destitute.

It would take more time than I am able to devote to your service, at present, to describe the injustice, the wrongs, the murders, the bloodshed, thefts, misery and woe that have been committed upon our people by the barbarous, inhuman, and lawless proceedings of the State of Missouri. And I would refer you, and the readers of your history who may be desirous of further information on this topic, to the evidence taken on my recent trial before the Municipal Court of Nauvoo, on Saturday, July 1st, 1843, on a writ of habeas corpus, which is published in pamphlet form by Messrs. Taylor & Woodruff, of this city.

After being thus inhumanly expelled by the government and people from Missouri, we found an asylum and friends in the State of

Illinois. Here, in the fall of 1839, we commenced a city called Nauvoo, in Hancock county, which, in December, 1840, received an act of incorporation from the Legislature of Illinois, and is endowed with as liberal powers as any city in the United States. Nauvoo, in every respect, connected with increase and prosperity, has exceeded the most sanguine expectations of thousands. It now contains near 1500 houses, and more than 15,000 inhabitants. The charter contains, amongst its important powers, privileges, or immunities, a grant for the "University of Nauvoo," with the same liberal powers of the city, where all the arts and sciences will grow with the growth, and strengthen the strength of this beloved city of the "saints of the last days." Another very commendatory provision of the charter is, that that portion of the citizens subject to military duty are organized into a body of independent military men, styled the "Nauvoo Legion," whose highest officer holds the rank, and is commissioned lieutenant-general. This legion, like other independent bodies of troops in this republican government, is at the disposal of the Governor of this State, and President of the United States. There is also an act of incorporation for an agricultural and manufacturing association, as well as the Nauvoo House Association.

The temple of God, now in the course of erection, being already raised one story, and which is 120 feet by 80 feet, of stone, with polished pilasters, of an entire new order of architecture, will be a splendid house for the worship of God, as well as an unique wonder for the world, it being built by the direct revelation of Jesus Christ for the salvation of the living and the dead.

Since the organization of this church its progress has been rapid, and its gain in numbers regular. Besides these United States, where nearly every place of notoriety has heard the glad tidings of the gospel of the Son of God, England, Ireland, and Scotland, have shared largely in the fulness of the everlasting gospel, and thousands have already gathered with their kindred saints, to this the cornerstone of Zion. Missionaries of this church have gone to the East Indies, to Australia, Germany, Constantinople, Egypt, Palestine, the Islands of the Pacific, and are now preparing to open the door in the extensive dominions of Russia.

There are no correct data by which the exact number of members composing this now extensive, and still extending, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints can be known. Should it be supposed at 150,000, it might still be short of the truth.

Believing the Bible to say what it means and mean what it says; and guided by revelation according to the ancient order of the fathers

to whom came what little light we enjoy ; and circumscribed only by the eternal limits of truth : this church must continue the even tenor of her way, and “spread undivided, and operate unspent.”

We believe in God the Eternal Father, and in his son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.

We believe that men will be punished for their own sins and not for Adam’s transgression.

We believe that through the atonement of Christ all men may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the gospel.

We believe that these ordinances are: 1st, Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ ; 2d, Repentance ; 3d, Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins ; 4th, Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.

We believe that a man must be called of God by “prophecy, and by laying on of hands,” by those who are in authority to preach the gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof.

We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive church, viz. apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, &c.

We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, &c.

We believe the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly ; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God.

We believe all that God has revealed, all that he does now reveal, and we believe that he will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

We believe in the literal gathering of Israel, and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes. That Zion will be built upon this continent. That Christ will reign personally upon the earth, and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisaical glory.

We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may.

We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates ; in obeying, honouring, and sustaining the law.

We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men ; indeed we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul ; “we believe all things : we hope all things :” we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is any thing virtuous, lovely, or of good report, or praiseworthy, we seek thereafter.

MORAVIANS,

OR MORE PROPERLY

UNITAS FRATRUM, OR UNITED BRETHREN'S CHURCH.*

BY L. D. VON SCHWEINITZ,

LATE SENIOR CIVILIS OF THE CHURCH OF U. F.

UNITED BRETHREN, or *Unitas Fratrum*, or sometimes called *Moravians*, were originally formed by the descendants of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, who, being persecuted for their religious tenets and non-conformity in their native country, founded a colony, under the patronage of Count Zinzendorf, on an estate of his, called Berthelsdorf, in Upper Lusatia, in the year 1722, to which colony the name of Herrnhut was given, on account of its situation on the southern declivity of a hill called Hutberg.

It was not until the number of emigrants from Bohemia and Moravia, who there found an asylum, had considerably increased, and many religiously disposed persons from other quarters, attracted by their pious zeal and their sufferings, had settled along them, that the diversity of sentiments, perceptible among so many zealous Christians of various modes of thinking, suggested to them the propriety of some general agreement concerning faith and rules of conduct. Accordingly, under the guidance of Count Zinzendorf, who, from an early age had entertained an idea of constituting a Christian community on the model of the primitive apostolic congregations, certain articles of union were proposed among them, which, leaving all the distinctive doctrines of the various Protestant denominations of Christians entirely out of question, adopted as articles of faith only those fundamental scripture truths in which they all agree, and at the same time introduced a system of social compact and church

* This article was originally prepared by Rev. Mr. Schweinitz, and has the sanction of the Board of the Moravian Church.

discipline resembling that of the ancient church of the Moravian Brethren, and intended to form a society in some degree such as the primitive churches are represented to have been.

All the inhabitants of Herrnhut, after mature consideration, adopted this social scheme and these statutes, by the name of a brotherly agreement, and pledged themselves mutually to its observance, in the year 1727, and thus formed the first stock of the present Society of United Brethren. Count Zinzendorf was justly in some measure considered the founder of the society, to which he thenceforward devoted his whole life, property and energy. It will be readily conceived, however, more especially after observing that further emigrations from Bohemia and Moravia were checked by the Saxon government at an early period, that the descendants of the emigrants, at this day, constitute but a small proportion of the present society. Individuals from all Protestant denominations, coinciding in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity common to all, and professing a desire to lead a truly Christian life, as members of such a community, under its peculiar regulations, were from the beginning admitted among them, without renouncing their original church and creed. On the contrary, to facilitate the maintenance of their connexion with their original churches, the society expressly includes three different tropes or modifications within its pale: the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the Moravian, which latter comprises all other Protestant denominations. Experience has taught that these differences, among persons so intimately associated, vanish of themselves to such a degree, that the original idea of these tropes is now maintained only as an evidence of the principle of their union, while its practical consequences have become altogether imperceptible.

The United Brethren, however, continue strenuously to object to being considered a separate sect or denomination, because their union is exclusively founded on general Christian doctrines, and their peculiarities relate solely to their social organization, which is intended only to facilitate their joint purpose of putting truly Christian principles of life and conduct into actual practice. They consequently admit of no peculiar articles of faith, confining themselves altogether to regulations of conduct and discipline. As a body they have at all times, when required by governments to point out their creed, professed general adherence to the Confession of Augsburg, as most congenial to the views of a majority; and although they do not pledge their ministers to an express adoption of its articles, it is agreed among them not to insist upon any doctrines utterly repugnant thereto. They avoid discussions respecting the speculative

truths of religion, and insist upon individual experience of the practical efficacy of the gospel, in producing a real change of sentiment and conduct, as the only essentials in religion.

They consider the manifestation of God in Christ as intended to be the most beneficial revelation of the Deity to the human race; and in consequence, they make the life, merits, acts, words, sufferings and death of the Saviour, the principal theme of their doctrine, while they carefully avoid entering into any theoretical disquisitions on the mysterious essence of the Godhead, simply adhering to the words of scripture. Admitting the sacred scriptures as the only source of divine revelation, they nevertheless believe that the Spirit of God continues to lead those who believe in Christ into all further truth; not by revealing new doctrines, but by teaching those, who sincerely desire to learn, daily better to understand and apply the truths which the scriptures contain. They believe that, to live agreeably to the gospel, it is essential to aim in all things to fulfil the will of God. Even in their temporal concerns they endeavour to ascertain the will of God; they do not, indeed, expect some miraculous manifestation of his will, but only endeavour to test the purity of their purposes by the light of the divine word. Nothing of consequence is done by them, as a society, until such an examination has taken place; and, in cases of difficulty, the question is decided by lot, to avoid the undue preponderance of influential men, and in the humble hope that God will guide them rightly by its decision, where their limited understanding fails them.

In former times the marriages of the members of the society were, in some respects, guarded as a concern of the society, as it was part of their social agreement that none should take place without the approval of the elders; and the elders' consent or refusal was usually determined by lot. But this custom was at length abandoned; and nothing is now requisite to obtain the consent of the elders, but propriety of conduct in the parties. They consider none of their peculiar regulations essential, but all liable to be altered or abandoned whenever it is found necessary, in order better to attain their great object—the promotion of piety. Such alterations are effected through the medium of their synods.

The society early undertook to propagate the gospel among heathen nations. The success of their attempt in this respect is generally known, and a great proportion of their energy is at this day devoted to this object. In the prosecution thereof, circumstances occurred which, combined with the increase of their numbers, and certain difficulties in their way at Herrnhut, induced the society to plant colo-

nies, on the plan of the mother society there, in different parts of Germany, England, Holland, America, &c., all of which, together, now constitute the Unity of the Brethren. Each individual colony, called a *place congregation*, is independent in its individual concerns, under the superintendence, however, of the Board of General Directors of the Unity; which superintendence, in England and America, is administered by subordinate local boards, in respect to all things not of a general nature; but they are responsible to the General Board of the Directors, at present seated at Berthelsdorf, near Herrnhut, and denominated the Board of Elders of the Unity. The appointments of all the ministers and officers of each community rest exclusively with this board. In England and America, however, these are committed to the local boards. To them is further committed the direction of all general objects of the whole society, such as their heathen missions, the support of superannuated ministers and their widows, and the education of the children of such of these as are without means of their own. For, as the principles and circumstances of the society prevent them from allotting a greater salary to any officers, than their decent maintainance requires, those among them, who are not possessed of fortunes, cannot lay by any thing for their old age, or for the education of their children; the charge of these, therefore, devolves upon the whole society.

The economical affairs of each individual community are administered by one of the elders of that particular community, with the concurrence of a committee elected biennially from among the inhabitants, generally by the votes of all the male members, or by an intermediate body thus elected.

The objects for which each community has thus to provide are, the erection and maintainance of a church, the support of the active ministers and other officers, of proper schools, and all other things necessary for the well-being of the community, and the preservation of good order; while the individuals composing it, are as entirely independent in their private property as any other persons whatever—each carrying on his particular business, for his own profit, and upon his own responsibility.

A contrary impression, viz.: that there exists a community of goods among them, is still very prevalent, especially in America. This is attributable to the fact, that, when their colonies in America were commenced, it was for some years found necessary to combine the efforts of all the members, in order to maintain themselves amid their difficulties; and, although each individual retained the absolute disposal of any property, formerly his own, their joint earnings, for the

time, went into a common stock, from which the daily necessities were supplied. This unnatural state of things, however, continued no longer than it was imperiously necessary. Many other erroneous conceptions have become prevalent, concerning the economical concerns of this society. The original members of it had nothing to depend on but their industry. Count Zinzendorf and some of his nearest connexions sacrificed the whole of their estates in the various undertakings, missions, and colonies. As the society grew, numbers of wealthy members afforded liberal aid; but the society never had any actual funds, upon which they could depend. Individual members borrowed the necessary sums, upon their own credit. These funds were invested, partly in commercial undertakings, partly in landed estates, and various manufactures, and the profits applied to pay the expenses of the society.

Upon the death of Count Zinzendorf (he died 1760), it was found that a debt had accrued, greatly exceeding the value of all the available investments. A separation of interests now took place. Each individual community assumed a proportionable share of the assets and debts, and thenceforward undertook the management of its individual concerns, and to provide for its own necessities by means of an institution, operating very much in the manner of a savings bank, termed the *Diacony* of each community. Moneys were taken up, under the special superintendence of the elders, and of the committee above mentioned, and invested; the proceeds went to defray the disbursements of that particular community; the understanding was, that, if the avails were such as to leave any thing to be disposed of after defraying their own expenses, such surplus was to go to aid other communities, whose means might not be so ample, or to assist the general concerns. Thus, in most communities of the United Brethren, certain trades or manufactures are carried on for their benefit, as such. By these means, together with the voluntary annual subscriptions of the members towards the maintainance of the ministers, and the support of the church and schools, the necessary funds are raised for defraying the charges on the particular communities, and for certain proportionate contributions, which each is expected to furnish to that fund of the Unity, which is established for the support of the superannuated ministers and other officers, and their widows, as well as the education of their children. The funds required in each community, for the purposes of police and conveniences, are raised by regular taxes on the householders, assessed by the committee before mentioned. The rest of the assets on hand, at the death of Count Zinzendorf, was put under the control of a special board of elders of

the Unity, and the proceeds applied to discharge the debt before mentioned. The disbursements required by the missions among the heathen are supplied by voluntary contributions. The greater part of the annual amount at the present time is furnished by persons not connected with the society. Some few of the West India missions are in part supported by the industry of the missionaries, and those in Labrador by a commercial establishment trading thither under the guidance of a society established at London. In the United States there is a society for propagating the gospel among the heathen, incorporated by several states, and consisting of members of the United Brethren's Church. This society has recently acquired large funds, by the bequest of one of its members. All these resources flow into the common fund, which is administered, and the missionary concern in general managed, by another department of the Board of Elders of the Unity, called the Missionary Department. A third department of this board is termed the Department of Education. This has charge, not only of the subject of the education of children throughout the society generally, but, in a special manner, of those who are educated at the public expense.

In many of the communities of the United Brethren in Germany, England, and America, boarding schools for the education of young persons of both sexes are established, in which not only their youth, but a great number of others, are instructed in useful sciences and polite acquirements. For many years these schools have sustained, and still maintain, a considerable reputation both in Europe and America. At Niesky, in Upper Lusatia, the Unity maintains a higher classical institution, where those receive a preparatory education, who intend to embrace the liberal professions, or to be prepared for the ministry. The latter complete their studies in a college situated at Gnadenfeld, in Silesia, which serves the purposes of a university. Similar institutions, upon a smaller scale, are established at Fulnec for the English, and at Nazareth for the American portion of the Unity. These are, properly speaking, theological seminaries only. Young men, desirous of devoting themselves to the medical or other learned professions, resort, of course, to the public universities of their respective countries. In the three departments of the Board of Elders of the Unity, before alluded to, taken collectively, the direction of the whole Unity is concentrated. This board, however, is responsible to the synods of the society, which meet at stated times, generally at intervals of from seven to twelve years, and from whom all its authority emanates. They are composed of bishops and certain other general officers of the society, such as the members of the Board of

Elders of the Unity for the time being, and of the representatives chosen by each individual community. At these meetings, a revision of all the concerns of the society and its parts takes place, and such alterations are adopted as circumstances seem to require. They are terminated by the appointment of a new Board of Elders of the Unity.

The following is a sketch of the mode of life of the United Brethren where they form separate communities, which, however, is not always the case; for, in many instances, societies belonging to the Unity are situated in larger and smaller cities and towns, intermingled with the rest of the inhabitants, in which cases their peculiar regulations are, of course, out of the question. In their separate communities, they do not allow the permanent residence of any persons as householders who are not members in full communion, and who have not signed the written instrument of the brotherly agreement, upon which their constitution and discipline rest; but they freely admit of the temporary residence among them of such persons as are willing to conform to their external regulations. According to these, all kinds of amusements, considered dangerous to strict morality, are forbidden, as balls, dancing, plays, gambling of any kind, and all promiscuous assemblies of the youth of both sexes. These, however, are not debarred from forming, under proper advice and parental superintendence, that acquaintance which their future matrimonial connexions may require.

In the communities on the European continent, whither, to this day, numbers of young persons of both sexes resort, in order to become members of the society, from motives of piety and a desire to prepare themselves to become missionaries among the heathen, and where, moreover, the difficulties of supporting a family greatly limit the number of marriages, a stricter attention to this point becomes necessary. On this account, the unmarried men and boys, not belonging to the families of the community, reside together, under the care of an elder of their own class, in a building called the Single Brethren's House, where, usually, divers trades and manufactures are carried on, for the benefit of the house or of the community, and which, at the same time, furnishes a cheap and convenient place for the board and lodging of those who are employed as journeymen, apprentices, or otherwise, in the families constituting the community. Particular daily opportunities of edification are there afforded them; and such a house is the place of resort, where the young men and boys of the families spend their leisure time, it being a general rule, that every member of the society shall devote himself to some useful occupation.

A similar house, under the guidance of a female superintendent, and under similar regulations, is called the Single Sisters' House, and is the common dwelling-place of all unmarried females, not members of any family, or not employed as servants in the families of the community. Even these regard the Sisters' House as their principal place of association at leisure hours. Industrious habits are here inculcated in the same way.

In the communities of the United Brethren in America, the facilities of supporting families, and the consequent early marriages, have superseded the necessity of Single Brethren's Houses; but they all have Sisters' Houses of the above description, which afford a comfortable asylum to aged unmarried females, while they furnish an opportunity of attending to the further education and improvement of the female youth after they have left school. In the larger communities, similar houses afford the same advantages to such widows as desire to live retired, and are called Widows' Houses. The individuals residing in these establishments pay a small rent, by which, and by the sums paid for their board, the expenses of these houses are defrayed, assisted occasionally by the profits on the sale of ornamental needlework, &c., on which some of the inmates subsist. The aged and needy are supported by the same means. Each division of sex and station, just alluded to, viz.: widows, single men and youths, single women and girls, past the age of childhood, is placed under the special guidance of elders of their own description, whose province it is to assist them in good advice and admonition, and to attend, as much as may be, to the spiritual and temporal welfare of each individual. The children of each sex are under the immediate care of the superintendent of the single choirs, as these divisions are termed. Their instruction in religion, and in all the necessary branches of human knowledge, in good schools, carried on separately for each sex, is under the special superintendence of the stated minister of each community, and of the Board of Elders. Similar special elders are charged to attend to the spiritual welfare of the married people. All these elders, of both sexes, together with the stated minister, to whom the preaching of the gospel is chiefly committed, (although all other elders who may be qualified participate therein,) and with the persons to whom the economical concerns of the community are entrusted, form together the Board of Elders, in which rests the government of the community, with the concurrence of the committee elected by the inhabitants for all temporal concerns. This committee superintends the observance of all regulations, has charge of the police, and decides differences between individuals. Matters of a general

nature are submitted to a meeting of the whole community, consisting either of all male members of age, or of an intermediate body elected by them.

Public meetings are held every evening in the week. Some of these are devoted to the reading of portions of scripture, others to the communications of accounts from the missionary stations, and others to the singing of hymns or selected verses. On Sunday mornings, the church litany is publicly read, and sermons are delivered to the congregation, which, in many places, is the case likewise in the afternoon. In the evening, discourses are delivered, in which the texts for that day are explained and brought home to the particular circumstances of the community. Besides these regular means of edification, the festival days of the Christian church, such as Easter, Pentecost, Christmas, &c., are commemorated in a special manner, as well as some days of peculiar interest in the history of the society. A solemn church music constitutes a prominent feature of their means of edification, music in general being a favourite employment of the leisure of many. On particular occasions, and before the congregation meets to partake of the Lord's Supper, they assemble expressly to listen to instrumental and vocal music interspersed with hymns, in which the whole congregation joins, while they partake together of a cup of coffee, tea, or chocolate, and light cakes, in token of fellowship and brotherly union. This solemnity is called a *Love Feast*, and is in imitation of the custom of the *Agapæ* in the primitive Christian churches. The Lord's Supper is celebrated at stated intervals, generally by all communicant members together, under very solemn but simple rites. Easter morning is devoted to a solemnity of a peculiar kind. At sunrise, the congregation assembles in the grave-yard; a service, accompanied by music, is celebrated, expressive of the joyful hopes of immortality and resurrection, and a solemn commemoration is made of all who have, in the course of the last year, departed this life from among them, and "gone home to the Lord"—an expression they often use to designate death. Considering the termination of the present life no evil, but the entrance upon an eternal state of bliss to the sincere disciples of Christ, they desire to divest this event of all its terrors. The decease of every individual is announced to the community by solemn music from a band of instruments. Outward appearances of mourning are discountenanced. The whole congregation follows the bier to the grave-yard (which is commonly laid out as a garden), accompanied by a band, playing the tunes of well-known verses, which express the hopes of eternal life and resurrection, and the corpse is deposited in the simple grave during the fune-

ral service. The preservation of the purity of the community is entrusted to the Board of Elders and its different members, who are to give instruction and admonition to those under their care, and make a discreet use of the established church discipline. In cases of immoral conduct, or flagrant disregard of the regulations of the society, the following discipline is resorted to. If exhortations are not successful, offenders are for a time restrained from participating in the holy communion, or called before the committee. For pertinacious bad conduct, or flagrant excesses, the culpable individual is dismissed from the society.

The ecclesiastical church officers, generally speaking, are the bishops, through whom the regular succession of ordination, transmitted to the United Brethren through the ancient Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, is preserved, and who alone are authorized to ordain ministers, but possess no authority in the government of the church, except such as they derive from some other office, being most frequently the presidents of some board of elders; the presbyters, or ordained stated ministers of the communities, and the deacons. The degree of deacon is the first bestowed upon young ministers and missionaries, by which they are authorized to administer the sacraments.

Females, although elders among their own sex, are never ordained; nor have they a vote in the deliberations of the Board of Elders, which they attend for the sake of information only.

It now remains to give some account of the number and extension of this society, which are often strangely exaggerated. On the continent of Europe, together with Great Britain, the number of persons living in their different communities, or formed into societies closely connected with the Unity, does not exceed thirteen or fourteen thousand, including children. Their number in the United States falls somewhat short of six thousand souls. Besides these there are about three times this number of persons dispersed through Germany, Livonia, &c., who are occasionally visited by brethren, and strengthened in their religious convictions, while they have no external connexion with the Unity. These cannot be considered members of the society, though they may maintain a spiritual connexion with it. The numbers of converts from heathen nations, are regularly reported, and do not now exceed 40,000 souls, comprehending all those who are in any way under the care of the missionaries. Indeed it never was the object of the society to attempt the Christianization of whole nations or tribes, as such must be a mere nominal conversion. They profess to admit those only to the rite of baptism who give evidence

of their faith by the change wrought in their life and conduct. On this account, they have every where introduced among their heathen converts a discipline similar to their own, as far as circumstances permit. It would be preposterous to conceive that the peculiar views, and the regulations of a society such as that of the United Brethren, could ever be adopted by any large body of men. They are exclusively calculated for small communities. Any one desirous of separating from the society meets with no hinderance.

The following is a succinct view of the principal establishments of the society. In the United States, they have separate communities, at Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Litiz, in Pennsylvania, and at Salem, in North Carolina. Bethlehem is, next to the mother community at Herrnhut, in Germany, their largest establishment. Besides these, there are congregations at Newport, in Rhode Island, at New York, at Philadelphia, Lancaster and York; at Graceham in Maryland; and several country congregations scattered through Pennsylvania, the members of which chiefly dwell on their plantations, but have a common place of worship. There are four of this description in North Carolina, in the vicinity of Salem. The whole number of congregations is twenty-two; of these there are ten village congregations, four city, and eight country congregations. The number of pastors and assistant pastors is twenty-four; two bishops, two administrators, four wardens, and four principals of schools. The total number of members, at present, in the United States, is about six thousand.

In England, their chief settlements are Fulnec in Yorkshire, Fairfield in Lancashire, Ockbrook in Derbyshire. Congregations exist likewise in London, Bedford, Bristol, Bath, Plymouth, Haverfordwest, together with a number of country congregations in divers villages. In Ireland, they have a considerable congregation at Gracehill, in the county of Antrim, and small congregations at Dublin, Gracefield, and Ballinderry. On the continent of Europe, Herrnhut, Niesky, and Kleinwelke, in Upper Lusatia; Gnadenfrey, Gnadenberg, Gnadenfeld and Neusaltz, in Silesia; Ebensdorf, near Lobenstein; Neudictendorf, in the duchy of Gosna; Königsfeld, in that of Baden; Neuwied on the Rhine; Christianfeld, in Holstein; Zeyst, near Utrecht, in Holland; and Sarepta, on the confines of Asiatic Russia, are the names of their separate communities; besides which are organized societies at Berlin, Rixdorf, Potsdam, Königsberg, Norden in Friesland, Copenhagen, Altona, Stockholm, Gottenburg, St. Petersburg, and Moscow.

Their principal missions among the heathens at this time are the

following: among the negro slaves in the three Danish West India islands; in Jamaica, St. Kitts, Antigua, Barbadoes, Tobago, and in Surinam, among the same description of persons; in Greenland, among the natives of that desolate region; in Labrador, among the Esquimaux; at the Cape of Good Hope, among the Hottentots and Caffres; and in North America, among the Delaware Indians in Upper Canada and in the Indian Territory, and among the Cherokees in Arkansas. It is a general principle of the society, that their social organization is in no case to interfere with their duties as citizens or subjects of governments under which they live, and wherever they are settled. They have always supported a good reputation, and been generally considered valuable members of the community, on account of the moral and industrious habits successfully inculcated by their system.

THE METHODIST SOCIETY.

BY THE REV. W. M. STILWELL,

NEW YORK.

THIS society was first composed of a number of members seceding from the Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of New York, in the year 1820, together with several of the trustees. It had its origin from the circumstance of the ruling preacher, so called, insisting on receiving the money collected in the different churches under his charge, through stewards of his own appointment, instead of by the trustees appointed according to law, and in accordance with the practice of the church in all time previous, together with certain resolutions passed by the New York Annual Conference of Ministers, to petition the legislature for a law recognising the peculiarities of the church discipline, by which the whole properties of the church would have been placed under the supervision and control of the body of ministers, who according to their discipline, from the bishop, downwards, are to take charge of the temporal and spiritual business of the church. A church was erected, and about 300 members organized, under one preacher, the Rev. William M. Stilwell, who withdrew from the travelling connexion, and assumed the pastoral charge of them, which he retains until this present year, (1843.) In the course of the three years following, they had erected two other places of worship, and formed a discipline, in which the general principles, as taught by the Methodists, were recognised; but in the government of the church there was a difference: 1. No bishop was allowed, but a president of each annual conference was chosen yearly, by ballot of the members thereof. 2. All ordained ministers, whether travelling or not, were allowed a seat in the annual conferences. 3. Two lay delegates from each quarterly conference could sit in the annual conference, with the ministers. 4. No rules or regulations for the church could be made unless a majority present were lay members. 5. A preacher could remain with a congregation as long as they agreed. 6. Class meetings, love feasts, &c., were to be attended;

the leader of each class being chosen by the members. 7. The property of the societies, to be vested in trustees of their own choice, and the ministers to have no oversight of the temporal affairs of the church. They prospered greatly for a few years, when some of the preachers and people, being desirous to have a more itinerant connexion, thought it best to unite with a body of seceders from the Methodist Episcopal Church, who held a convention in Baltimore, and took the name of Protestant Methodist Church: since which the Methodist Society have not sought to enlarge their body so much, as to supply such congregations as may feel a disposition to enjoy a liberty, which the other bodies of dissenting Methodists, as well as the Methodist Episcopal Church, do not see fit to grant to the laity. At the present time they have three annual conferences, and are prosperous according to the efforts made, perhaps as well as other churches. The above may be considered a sufficient notice of the "Methodist Society," and persons wishing farther information will find it in a small work entitled "Rise and Progress of the Methodist Society," printed in New York, 1822.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

BY THE REV. NATHAN BANGS, D.D.,

NEW YORK.

It is well known that the founder of Methodism, under God, was the Rev. John Wesley, a presbyter in the Church of England, who, after his own conversion, set out with a simple desire to revive pure and undefiled religion in the church of which he was a member and a minister. Of the several steps by which he was led to adopt the measures he did, it is not necessary particularly to mention; as in this sketch it is designed to notice those events only which more especially relate to the rise and progress of Methodism in America. It is therefore sufficient for our purpose to remark, that John Wesley commenced his work in the University of Oxford, where he had been educated, in the year 1739, and that from there it spread in different directions throughout Great Britain and Ireland, until by one of those providential occurrences, which mark all human events from which great results have their origin, it was introduced into this country.

That Mr. Wesley was actuated by a pure desire to revive and spread experimental and practical godliness, is most evident from all his actions, from his numerous writings, and much more from the following general rules which he drew up for the government of his societies in 1743, and which still remain the same in Europe and America, except the item on *slavery*, which was inserted by the American Conference in 1784, and the one on *drunkenness*, which has been altered for the worse it is believed, as it does not prohibit "the buying or selling of spirituous liquors," as Mr. Wesley's Rule did.

GENERAL RULES OF THE UNITED METHODIST SOCIETIES.

1. In the latter end of the year 1739, eight or ten persons came to Mr. Wesley in London, who appeared to be deeply convinced of sin, and earnestly groaning for redemption. They desired (as did

two or three more the next day) that he would spend some time with them in prayer, and advise them how to flee from the wrath to come, which they saw continually hanging over their heads. That he might have more time for this great work, he appointed a day when they might all come together, which, from thenceforward, they did every week, viz., on Thursday in the evening. To these, and as many more as desired to join with them, (for their number increased daily,) he gave those advices from time to time which he judged most needful for them; and they always concluded their meetings with prayer suited to their several necessities.

2. This was the rise of the United Society, first in Europe, and then in America. Such a society is no other than "A company of men having the form, and seeking the power of godliness, united, in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their salvation."

3. That it may the more easily be discerned, whether they are indeed working out their own salvation, each society is divided into smaller companies, called classes, according to their respective places of abode. There are about twelve persons in a class; one of whom is styled the leader. It is his duty,

I. To see each person in his class, once a week, at least, in order,

a. To inquire how their souls prosper;

b. To advise, reprove, comfort, or exhort, as occasion may require;

c. To receive what they are willing to give, toward the relief of the preachers, church, and poor.*

II. To meet the minister and the stewards of the society once a week, in order,

a. To inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly, and will not be reprov'd;

b. To pay to the stewards what they have received of their several classes in the week preceding.

4. There is one only condition previously required of those who desire admission into these societies, viz., "a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins;" but wherever this is really fixed in the soul, it will be shown by its fruits. It is therefore expected of all who continue therein, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

* This part refers to towns and cities, where the poor are generally numerous, and church expenses considerable.

First, by doing no harm; by avoiding evil of every kind, especially that which is most generally practised. Such as

The taking of the name of God in vain;

The profaning the day of the Lord, either by doing ordinary work thereon, or by buying or selling;

Drunkenness, or drinking spirituous liquors, unless in cases of necessity;

The buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them.

Fighting, quarrelling, brawling; brother going to law with brother; returning evil for evil, or railing for railing; the using many words in buying or selling;

The buying or selling goods that have not paid the duty;

The giving or taking things on usury, i. e., unlawful interest;

Uncharitable or unprofitable conversation, particularly speaking evil of magistrates or of ministers;

Doing to others as we would not they should do unto us;

Doing what we know is not for the glory of God; as,

The putting on of gold and costly apparel;

The taking such diversions as cannot be used in the name of the Lord Jesus;

The singing those songs, or reading those books which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God;

Softness and needless self-indulgence;

Laying up treasure upon earth;

Borrowing without a probability of paying; or taking up goods without a probability of paying for them.

5. It is expected of all who continue in these societies, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

Secondly, by doing good; by being in every kind merciful after their power, as they have opportunity—doing good of every possible sort, and, as far as is possible, to all men;

To their bodies, according to the ability which God giveth, by giving food to the hungry, by clothing the naked, by visiting or helping them that are sick, or in prison;

To their souls, by instructing, reproving, or exhorting all we have any intercourse with: trampling under foot that enthusiastic doctrine, that “we are not to do good, unless our hearts be free to it.”

By doing good, especially to them that are of the household of faith, or groaning so to be: employing them preferably to others; buying one of another; helping each other in business,—and so much the more, because the world will love its own, and them only.

By all possible diligence and frugality, that the gospel be not blamed.

By running with patience the race which is set before them; denying themselves, and taking up their cross daily; submitting to bear the reproach of Christ; to be as the filth and offscouring of the world; and looking that men should say all manner of evil of them falsely, for the Lord's sake.

6. It is expected of all who desire to continue in these societies, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

Thirdly, by attending upon all the ordinances of God: such are,

The public worship of God;

The ministry of the word, either read or expounded;

The Supper of the Lord;

Family and private prayer;

Searching the scriptures; and

Fasting or abstinence.

7. These are the general rules of our societies; all which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word, which is the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice. And all these we know his Spirit writes on truly awakened hearts. If there be any among us who observe them not, who habitually break any of them: let it be known unto them who watch over that soul, as they who must give an account. We will admonish him of the error of his ways; we will bear with him for a season. But, if then, he repent not, he hath no more place among us. We have delivered our own souls.

Efforts have been made and are now making to restore the rule relating to drunkenness to the phraseology in which Mr. Wesley left it; but as these rules are declared to be unalterable by the restrictive regulations which bind the action of the General Conference, except on the recommendation of three-fourths of all the members of the several annual conferences who shall be present and vote on such recommendation, and then by a vote of two-thirds of the General Conference: a sufficient number of votes has not been procured to effect the alteration.

With these introductory remarks we proceed to a few historical sketches of the rise and progress of Methodism on this continent.

The first Methodist society in America, was established in the city of New York, in the year 1766. The circumstances attending this event were somewhat peculiar, and mark the providence of God over his people, in a very striking manner. A few pious emigrants from Ireland, who, previously to their removal, had been members of the

Methodist society in their own country, landed in this city. Among their number was Mr. Philip Embury, a local preacher. Coming among strangers and finding no pious associates with whom they could confer, they came very near making "shipwreck of faith and a good conscience." In this state of religious declension they were found the next year on the arrival of another family from Ireland, among whom was a pious "mother in Israel," to whose zeal in the cause of God they were all indebted for the revival of the spirit of piety among them. Soon after her arrival she ascertained that those, who had preceded her, had so far departed from their "first love," as to be mingling in the frivolities and amusements of the world. The knowledge of this painful fact excited her indignation; and, with a zeal which deserves commemoration, she suddenly entered the room in which they were assembled, seized the pack of cards with which they were playing, and threw them into the fire. She then addressed herself to them in terms of expostulation, and turning to Mr. Embury, she said: "You must preach to us, or we shall all go to hell together, and God will require our blood at your hands!" This pointed appeal had its intended effect, in awakening his attention to the perilousness of their condition. Yet, as if to excuse himself from the performance of an obvious duty, he tremblingly replied: "I cannot preach, for I have neither a house nor congregation." "Preach in your own house first, and to our own company," was the reply. Feeling the responsibility of his situation, and not being able any longer to resist the importunities of his reprover, he consented to comply with her request, and accordingly he preached his first sermon "in his own hired house," to five persons only. This, it is believed, was the first Methodist sermon ever preached in America.

As they continued to assemble together for mutual edification, so their numbers were gradually increased, and they were comforted and strengthened by "exhorting one another daily." Notwithstanding the fewness of their number, and the secluded manner in which they held their meetings: they very soon began to attract attention, and they accordingly found that they must either procure a larger place, or preclude many from their meetings who were desirous to attend.

This led them to rent a room of larger dimensions in the neighbourhood, the expense of which was paid by voluntary contributions. An event happened soon after they began to assemble in this place, which brought them into more public notice, and to attract a greater number of hearers. This was the arrival of Captain Webb, an officer of the British army, at that time stationed in Albany, in the State of New York. He had been brought to the knowledge of the truth, under the

searching ministry of the Rev. John Wesley, who, under God, was the founder of Methodism, in the city of Bristol, England, about the year 1765 ; and, though a military character, such was his thirst for the salvation of immortal souls, that he was constrained to declare unto them the loving kindness of God.

His first appearance as a stranger among the "little flock" in the city of New York, in his military costume, gave them some uneasiness, as they feared that he had come to "spy out their liberties," or to interrupt them in their solemn assemblies ; but when they saw him kneel in prayer, and otherwise participate with them in the worship of God, their fears were exchanged for joy, and on a farther acquaintance they found Captain Webb had "partaken of like precious faith" with themselves. He was accordingly invited to preach. The novelty of his appearance in the badges of a military officer, excited no little surprise. This, together with the energy with which he spoke in the name of the Lord Jesus, drew many to the place of worship, and hence the room in which they now assembled, soon became too small to accommodate all who wished to assemble. But what greatly encouraged them was, that sinners were awakened and converted to God, who were added to the little society.

To accommodate all who wished to hear, they next hired a rigging-loft in William Street, and fitted it up for a place of worship. Here they assembled for a considerable time, and were edified in faith and love, under the labours of Mr. Embury, who was occasionally assisted by Captain Webb.

While the society was thus going forward in their "work of faith and labour of love" in New York : Captain Webb made excursions upon Long Island, and even went as far as Philadelphia, preaching, wherever he could find an opening, the gospel of the Son of God ; and success attended his labours, many being awakened to a sense of their sinfulness through his pointed ministry, and were brought to the "knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins." In consequence of the accession of numbers to the society, and the continual increase of those who wished to hear the word : the rigging-loft became also too small, and they began to consult together on the propriety of building a house of worship.

But in the accomplishment of this pious undertaking, many difficulties were to be encountered. The members in the society were yet but few in number, most of them of the poorer class, and of course had but a limited acquaintance and influence in the community. For some time a painful suspense kept them undetermined. But while all were deliberating on the most suitable means to be adopted to

accomplish an object so desirable: the elderly lady, whose pious zeal has been already mentioned, while earnestly engaged in prayer for direction in this important enterprise, received, with inexpressible sweetness and power, this answer, *I, the Lord, will do it.* At the same time a plan was suggested to her mind, which, on being submitted to the society, was generally approved of, and finally adopted. They proceeded to issue a subscription paper, waited on the mayor of the city and other opulent citizens, to whom they explained their object, and received from them such liberal donations, that they succeeded in purchasing several lots in John Street, on which they erected a house of worship 60 feet in length, by 42 in breadth, calling it, from respect to the venerable founder of Methodism, *Wesley Chapel.* This was the first meeting-house ever erected for a Methodist congregation in America; this was in the year 1768; and the first sermon was preached in it October 30, 1768, by Mr. Embury. This, therefore, may be considered as the beginning of Methodism in this country.

While this house was in progress, feeling the necessity of a more competent preacher, they addressed a letter to Mr. Wesley, urging upon him the propriety of sending them the needful help. So zealous were they in this good cause, that, after describing at large the general state of things here, they say: "With respect to money for the payment of the preachers' passage over, if they could not procure it, we would sell our coats and shirts to procure it for them."

Such an appeal had its effect. Mr. Wesley immediately adopted measures for complying with their request, and two preachers, namely, Richard Boardman and Joseph Pillmore, volunteered their services for America; and Mr. Wesley sent with them fifty pounds, "As," he says, "a token of our brotherly love." These were the first regular itinerant preachers who visited this country; and they landed at Gloucester Point, six miles below Philadelphia, October 24, 1769. They immediately entered upon their Master's work, Mr. Boardman taking his station in New York, and Mr. Pillmore in Philadelphia, occasionally exchanging with one another, and sometimes making excursions into the country. Wherever they went, multitudes flocked to hear the word, and many were induced to seek an interest in the Lord Jesus Christ.

About the same time that Mr. Embury was thus laying the foundation for this spiritual edifice in New York, and Captain Webb was, to use his own words, "felling the trees on Long Island," and some other places: Mr. Robert Strawbridge, another local preacher from Ireland, came over and settled in Frederick county, Maryland, and commenced preaching "Christ and him crucified" with success,

many sinners being reclaimed from the error of their ways by his instrumentality. After spending some time in Philadelphia, preaching with great fervour and acceptance to the people, Mr. Pillmore paid a visit to Mr. Strawbridge, in Maryland, and endeavoured to strengthen his hands in the Lord. He also went into some parts of Virginia and North Carolina; and wherever he went he found the people eager to hear the gospel, to whom he preached with success, and formed some societies. On his return to Philadelphia, under date of October 31, 1769, he addressed an encouraging letter to Mr. Wesley, in which he states that there were about one hundred members in society in that city, which shows the good effects of Captain Webb's labours among that people.

Mr. Boardman, on his arrival in New York, found the society in a prosperous state under the labours of Mr. Embury. On the 24th of April, 1770, he addressed a letter to Mr. Wesley, in which he informs him that the house would contain about 1700 people, and that he found a most willing people to hear, and the prospect every where brightening before him. Other local preachers occasionally came over, and were employed with various degrees of usefulness.

From this encouraging representation of things, Mr. Wesley was induced to adopt measures for furnishing additional labourers in this part of the Lord's vineyard. Accordingly, the next year, 1771, Mr. Francis Asbury, and Mr. Richard Wright, offered themselves for this work, were accepted by Mr. Wesley, and sent with the blessing of God to the help of their brethren in America. They landed in Philadelphia, October 7, 1771, and immediately repaired to the meeting, and heard a sermon from Mr. Pillmore, whom they found at his station and in his work. They were most cordially received. "The people," says Mr. Asbury, "looked on us with pleasure, hardly knowing how to show their love sufficiently, bidding us welcome with fervent affection, and receiving us as angels of God."

On his arrival, Mr. Asbury, who had been appointed by Mr. Wesley to the general charge of the work, commenced a more extended method of preaching the gospel, by itinerating through the country, as well as preaching in the cities; by which means a more diffusive spread was given to the work of God. His energetic example excited the others to a more zealous activity in the cause, and hence many new societies were established, and brought under disciplinary regulations. In Kent county, Maryland, and various places in Virginia and North Carolina, through the labours of Mr. Strawbridge and Robert Williams, preaching was commenced; and these places were visited by Mr. Asbury and Mr. Pillmore, the latter of whom

visited Norfolk, Virginia, and penetrated into North and South Carolina; nor did he stop until he reached Savannah, Georgia.

In this way the work of reformation went on until the arrival of Mr. Rankin, in June, 1773, who, being appointed to supersede Mr. Asbury as general superintendent, held the first conference in the city of Philadelphia, July 4, 1773, at which time there were 10 travelling preachers and 1160 members in the various societies. At this conference, they adopted the Wesleyan plan of stationing the preachers, and taking minutes of their doings.

The first meeting house in the city of Baltimore was built early in the year 1774.

It appears that God blessed the labours of his servants this year, and that they extended their labours into the State of New Jersey, and into various places in the states before mentioned; for we find that at the next conference, which was held May 25, 1774, in the city of Philadelphia, they had so increased that there were returned on the minutes 17 travelling preachers, and 2073 private members.

During this year, Messrs. Boardman and Pillmore left the continent, and returned to England; the former, who had much endeared himself to the people by his truly Christian deportment, and faithfulness in preaching, never to return; the latter soon came back, was admitted and ordained a minister in the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which he remained until his death. Through the labours of Mr. Williams, the work extended to Petersburg, Virginia, and from there over the Roanoke river some distance into South Carolina; so that three preachers were sent from the conference into that part of the vineyard, and towards the close of the year a most remarkable revival of religion followed their efforts. Such were the blessed effects of their evangelical labours, that they had increased, as was found at the next conference, to 3148, and the number of preachers was 19.

No one individual contributed more to extend the work of God on every hand, than Mr. Asbury, who travelled extensively and laboured most indefatigably for the salvation of souls, devoting his whole time and attention to this holy work. Others, to be sure, imitated his noble example, among whom was Mr. Shadford, whose labours were greatly blessed; as also the Rev. Mr. Jarrat, a pious and evangelical minister of the English Church, who entered heartily into the work, giving the weight of his influence in favour of experimental and practical godliness, and assisted the Methodist preachers much by his cordial co-operation with them, as also by administering baptism

and the Lord's Supper, to the children and members of their congregations. And though the minds of the people began to be much excited on the subject of the war which was then approaching; they were blessed with one of the most remarkable revivals of religion which had ever been witnessed in that part of the country, if, indeed, in any other portion of America. An account of this great work, written by Mr. Jarrat, was published and extensively read at the time.

God began now to raise up men in this country to preach that gospel which they had found "to be the power of God unto salvation." Among others, we find Freeborn Garrettson, whose name appears on the minutes of conference of 1776, and who became one of the most zealous and successful ministers of the Lord Jesus.

It is not to be supposed that this great work would go on without opposition. The lukewarm clergy and the wicked of all classes manifested their hostility in a variety of ways; but they were so far from retarding the work, that their persecution only tended to add a fresh stimulus to the fervent zeal of God's servants, and to make them more bold and courageous in the cause which they had espoused. In the year 1776, after the revolutionary contest had commenced, persecution against the Methodist missionaries found a pretext in the fact, that most of them were from England, and that some of them had manifested a partiality for their king and country, and moreover that they were all under the direction of a leader who had written against the American principles and measures. In consequence of this, all the English preachers, except Mr. Asbury, returned home before the close of the year 1777, and early in the year 1778, he was obliged to seclude himself from public observation, which he did by retiring to the house of Judge White, a pious member of the society, in the State of Delaware, where he remained, only occasionally visiting his friends and preaching privately, for about one year.

He was not the only sufferer during that troublesome time. Mr. Freeborn Garrettson was whipped, thrown from his horse, bruised and mangled, and finally cast into prison, for preaching the word of life. Mr. Joseph Hartley, also, was persecuted in a variety of ways, and at last imprisoned. Their friends, however, interceded for them, the hearts of their enemies were softened, and finding no just cause for their condemnation, they were liberated, and soon they preached the gospel with such power, that in those very places where the persecution had raged, God poured out his Spirit, and thousands were converted to God, among whom were many of their most violent persecutors.

During the war of the revolution, as might be expected, the

preachers and people had to contend with a variety of difficulties; some places, particularly New York and Norfolk, had to be abandoned entirely, and others were but partially supplied. Yet they held on their way, and God owned and blessed their pious efforts; so that at the conference of 1783, at the close of this sanguinary conflict, they had 43 preachers, and 13,740 private members; so greatly had God prospered them, even in the midst of war and bloodshed.

We come now, in 1784, to a very important era in the history of Methodism. The independence of the United States had been achieved, and acknowledged by the powers of Europe; and the churches in this country had become totally separated from all connexion with the hierarchies of England, the Methodist societies as well as others. Hitherto the Methodist preachers had been considered merely as lay-preachers, and of course had not authority to administer the ordinances; and hence the members of the societies had been dependent upon other ministers for the rite of baptism and the Lord's Supper. This had created so much dissatisfaction among them that, contrary to the wishes and advice of Mr. Asbury and many others, some of the southern preachers, in the year 1770, had ordained each other, and began to form a party to whom they administered the ordinances. Through the persuasive influence of Mr. Asbury and those who believed and acted with him, these malecontents had desisted from their disorderly proceedings; and now, at the close of the revolutionary struggle, they united in urging upon Mr. Wesley the necessity and propriety of his adopting measures to afford them relief. Though he had hitherto resisted all solicitations to exercise the power with which he fully believed the great Head of the Church had invested him, to ordain preachers for the benefit of his own societies, because he did not wish to disturb the established order of things in the Church of England: yet now, that that church had no longer any jurisdiction in this country, he felt himself at full liberty, as he did not interfere with any man's right, to set apart men whom he judged well qualified for that work, to administer the sacraments to the Methodists in America. Accordingly, on the 2d day of September, in the year of our Lord 1784, assisted by other presbyters, he consecrated Thomas Coke, LL. D., a presbyter in the Church of England, as a superintendent, and likewise ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to the office of elders, and sent them over to America, with instructions to organize the societies here into a separate and independent church, furnishing them, at the same time, with forms of ordination for deans, elders, and superintendents, and likewise with forms for administering baptisms and the consecration and administration

of the elements of the Lord's Supper. Being thus furnished with proper credentials, Dr. Coke, in company with Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey, sailed for this country; and at a conference which was called for the express purpose of considering the plan prepared by Mr. Wesley, convened in the city of Baltimore, Dec. 25, 1784, the measures were unanimously approved of; Dr. Coke was recognised in his character of superintendent; Mr. Asbury was unanimously elected a joint superintendent with him; and, on the 27th day of the same month, he was consecrated by Dr. Coke, assisted by several elders, having been previously ordained deacon and elder, to his high and responsible office. Twelve others of the preachers were elected and consecrated deacons and elders, and three to the order of deacon. Mr. Wesley had also sent an abridgment of the Book of Common Prayer, containing the forms of service above mentioned, and also twenty-five articles of religion, accompanied with various other rules for the regulation of the ministers and members of the newly-formed church, all of which were adopted by the conference.

Being thus regularly organized, they went forth to their work with renewed faith and zeal, and were every where received by the people in their proper character, as accredited ministers of the Lord Jesus, duly authorized to administer the ordinances of God's word, and to perform all the functions belonging to their holy office.

As this organization has frequently been assailed as being unscriptural, and contrary to primitive usage: it may be well to state a few of the arguments on which it rests for support.

1. In the first place, there appeared to be a loud call for these measures, arising from the general state of things in this country. As to the clergy of the English Church, the most of them had fled from the country during the stormy day, and those who remained, with very few exceptions, were fit for any thing rather than for ministers of the gospel. From the hands of these men the Methodists were unwilling to receive the ordinances. As to the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, they would neither baptize the children unless at least one of the parents professed faith in their doctrines, nor admit these to the communion table, unless they became members of their church. The Baptists were more rigid than either, as they would admit none to church-fellowship unless they had been baptized by immersion. To none of these conditions could the Methodists conscientiously submit. Hence a necessity, originating from the state of things in this country, compelled them either to remain destitute of the ordinances, to administer them with unconsecrated hands, or to provide for them in the manner they did.

2. Those who laid hands on Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey, namely, Mr. Wesley, Dr. Coke, and Mr. Creighton, were all regular presbyters in the Church of England; and those who laid hands on Dr. Coke, and thereby set him apart for a superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, were also presbyters, regularly ordained to that order and office in the Church of God.

3. It appears manifest, from several passages of scripture, particularly Acts xiii. 1, 2, and 1 Tim. iv. 14, and the testimonies of the primitive fathers of the church, that presbyters and bishops were of the same order, and that they originally possessed and exercised the power of ordination.

4. The doctrine of an uninterrupted succession from the apostles, in a third order, made such by a triple consecration, as distinct from and superior to elders, has been discarded by many of the most eminent ecclesiastical writers, as resting upon no solid foundation, not being susceptible of proof from any authentic source.

5. Mr. Wesley possessed rights over the Methodists which no other man did or could possess, because they were his spiritual children, raised up under his preaching and superintendence, and hence they justly looked to him for a supply of the ordinances of Jesus Christ.

6. Therefore, in exercising the power of ordination, and providing for the organization of the Methodist societies in America into a church, he invaded no other man's right, nor yet assumed that which did not belong to him.

7. Hence he did not, as the objection which this argument is designed to refute supposes, ordain either presbyters or a bishop for the English Church, or for any other church then existing, but simply and solely for the Methodist societies in America; and, therefore, in doing this necessary work, he neither acted inconsistently with himself as a presbyter of the Church of England, nor incompatibly with his frequent avowals to remain in that church, and not to separate from it.

8. For, in fact, in organizing the Methodist Episcopal Church he did not separate either from the English or Protestant Episcopal Church; for the former had no existence in America, and the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized three years before the Protestant Episcopal Church went into operation. Hence he acted perfectly consistent with himself, with all his avowals of attachment to the Church of England, while he proceeded to organize a church here; for, while he did this, and thereby established a separate and independent church in America, where the English Church had no jurisdiction, where both the political and ecclesiastical power of Eng-

land was totally annihilated, and where the Protestant Episcopal had then no existence, he and his people in England still remained members of the Church of England, and he invaded not the rights of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the least degree, seeing it had no existence.

9. While the scriptures are silent in respect to the particular *form* of church government which should be established, they certainly allow of an *episcopal form*, because it is not incompatible with any known precept or usage of primitive Christianity.

10. This is farther manifest from the acknowledged fact that the apostles and evangelists did exercise a *jurisdiction* over the entire church—presbyters, deacons, and people; though at the same time there is no proof that as to *order*, created such by a *third* consecration, they were higher than presbyters.

11. Distinguishing, therefore, between the power of *ordination* and the power of *jurisdiction*, we may see how an episcopal government may be created by a presbyterial ordination, and hence justify the act of Mr. Wesley and his associates in setting apart Dr. Coke to the office of a superintendent.

12. Another argument in favour of these measures arises out of the character of the men engaged in this business. As for John Wesley, it is almost superfluous to say any thing in his commendation, as his qualifications for a minister of the Lord Jesus, his deep experience in the things of God, the evangelical character, and the astonishing success of his ministrations, place him beyond the reach of censure, and elevate him high in the estimation of all who know how to estimate true worth of character.

As to Dr. Coke, for about six years previous to his sailing to America, he had given evidence of an entire devotion to the cause of God, of a genuine experience of divine things, and of his ardent attachment to the cause of Methodism as promulgated by Mr. Wesley.

Mr. Creighton was a presbyter of the Church of England, a man of sound understanding and of deep piety.

These were the men, all regularly ordained presbyters of the Church of England, who consecrated Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey, and then they assisted in the consecration of Dr. Coke to the office of a superintendent.

And as to Mr. Francis Asbury, he had furnished the most indubitable evidence of his qualifications to fill the office to which he was called both by the appointment of Mr. Wesley and the unanimous vote of his brethren, those very brethren who had borne witness to his conduct for about eleven years, during which time he had made

“full proof of his ministry,” and whose subsequent life fully justified the wisdom of their choice.

These are the facts, expressed in as few words as possible, on which we found the validity of our church organization, of our ministerial orders, and the scriptural character of our ordinances.

Having so particularly detailed the history of this church thus far, our subsequent narrative must necessarily be brief, as the space allotted to this article will not allow of a very minute presentation of facts.

Being thus regularly organized, and furnished with proper credentials as ministers of the Lord Jesus, they went forth to their work with greater confidence than ever, and the Lord abundantly blessed their labours to the awakening and conversion of souls. New circuits were formed, new societies were established, and believers were “built up upon their most holy faith.” And as they thus spread abroad in every direction, over such a large surface of country: it became inconvenient for the preachers all to assemble annually in one conference for the transaction of business; hence several conferences were held the same year, at suitable distances from each other, at which the superintending bishop attended, presided over their deliberations, ordained such as were elected by the conferences to the order of deacons or elders, and appointed the preachers to their several stations and circuits.

The first General Conference was held in the year 1792. The necessity for this arose out of the increase of their work, the incompetency of the several annual conferences to form rules and regulations in harmony one with the other, which should be binding upon the whole, and the utter impracticability of their all coming together at the same time and place to do their business. To remedy the inconvenience arising out of this state of things, the annual conferences had agreed that there should be a General Conference held once in four years, to be composed of all the travelling elders in full connexion, to whom should be committed the entire authority of making rules for the regulation of the church. At this General Conference a secession was made, headed by James O’Kelley, a presiding elder in Virginia; because he was dissatisfied with the bishop’s power of stationing the preachers, and pleaded for an appeal to the Conference. This caused considerable disturbance for a season, in some parts of Virginia and North Carolina; but he very soon lost his influence, and his party became scattered, and finally came to naught; while the Methodist Episcopal Church went on its way increasing in numbers and influence. At this time there were 266

travelling preachers, and 65,980 members of the church. Circuits had been formed and societies established throughout nearly every State and Territory in the Union, and also in Upper Canada, the whole of which was under the able and energetic superintending of Bishop Asbury, who travelled from six to seven thousand miles annually, preaching generally every day, and on the sabbath twice or thrice.

In 1800 Richard Whatcoat was elected and ordained a bishop, and immediately entered upon his work, and greatly assisted Bishop Asbury in his arduous labours.

Such was the increase of members and preachers, that it was found quite inconvenient for even all the elders to assemble in General Conference quadrennially; and hence in 1808, measures were adopted to form a delegated General Conference, to be composed of not less than one for every seven of the members of the annual conferences, nor more than one for every five, to be chosen either by ballot or by seniority; at the same time the power of this delegated conference was limited by constitutional restrictions.

The first delegated conference assembled in the city of New York, in the year 1812, in which Bishops Asbury and McHendree, the latter of whom had been elected and consecrated a bishop in 1808, presided. In 1816 Bishop Asbury died, and in the same year, at the General Conference held in Baltimore, Enoch George, and Robert R. Roberts, were elected and consecrated bishops.

In 1819 the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was formed. Its object was "to assist the several annual conferences to extend their missionary labours throughout the United States and elsewhere." This society has contributed mightily to diffuse the work of God, in the poor and destitute portions of our own country, among the aboriginal tribes of the United States and territories, among the slaves of the South, and Southwest, and it has sent its missionaries to Africa, to South America, and even to Oregon, beyond the Rocky Mountains; and thousands will doubtless rise up at a future day and praise God for the blessings they have received through the instrumentality of this godlike institution.

In this way the good work has continued to spread until now, 1843, when there are 4,286 travelling, and 7,730 local preachers, and 1,068,525 private members of the church, including exhorters, stewards, class leaders, and trustees.

This great prosperity, however, has not been unattended with difficulties from without as well as within the church. Various individuals have arisen at different times, who have become dissatisfied

with the government and some of the usages of the church, and not being able to effect an alteration in conformity to their wishes, have finally seceded and attempted to establish separate communities. The most considerable of these, beside that of James O'Kelly, already mentioned, was that which took place in 1830, when the "Methodist Protestant Church" was formed by a convention of delegates, assembled by previous arrangement, in the city of Baltimore, in which they provided for a mixture of lay and clerical influence in the government, both in the legislative, judicial, and executive departments; in the mean time abolishing Episcopacy, and substituting, in the place of bishops, presidents of their Annual and General Conferences, to be elected whenever those bodies may assemble for the transaction of business. They hold fast, however, all the fundamental doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and likewise retain the use of class and quarterly meetings, love-feasts, and the sacramental services, annual and general conferences, and an itinerant ministry.

Another secession has just commenced, ostensibly on the abolition principles and movements; but they manifest the like hostility to those features of our government growing out of the Episcopal form, and seem determined to establish one more in conformity with their views of equal rights and privileges.

How far these brethren may realize their wishes, remains to be seen. It is certainly an evidence of the strong convictions with which all the leading doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church have been received, that none of the seceding bodies have abjured any of these; and so far as they may succeed in propagating them, we wish them all success, while we cannot but think, that they would have given them a still wider circulation had they remained quietly and firmly attached to their brethren, and continued to work in the "old ways." Be this as it may, the Methodist Episcopal Church so far from being shaken by these thrusts at her peculiarities, or retarded in her career of usefulness, has seemed to assume greater stability, and much to increase in her prosperity; and this, doubtless, she will do, so long as she keeps "a single eye" to the glory of God, and aims simply and solely, as it is believed she has done heretofore, for the salvation of a lost and ruined world.

DOCTRINES.

The following articles of faith contain all the cardinal doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and are declared, by the restrictive

regulations which limit the powers of the General Conference, to be unalterable.

I. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.*—There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity :—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. *Of the Word, or Son of God, who was made very Man.*—The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

III. *Of the Resurrection of Christ.*—Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

IV. *Of the Holy Ghost.*—The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

V. *The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.*—The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. By the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

The Names of the Canonical Books.—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the First Book of Samuel, the Second Book of Samuel, the First Book of Kings, the Second Book of Kings, the First Book of Chronicles, the Second Book of Chronicles, the Book of Ezra, the Book of Nehemiah, the Book of Esther, the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes or the Preacher, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, Four Prophets the greater, Twelve Prophets the less: all the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account canonical.

VI. *Of the Old Testament.*—The Old Testament is not contrary to the New ; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth : yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

VII. *Of Original or Birth Sin.*—Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

VIII. *Of Free Will.*—The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God ; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

IX. *Of the Justification of Man.*—We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings :—wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.

X. *Of Good Works.*—Although good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgments : yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

XI. *Of Works of Supererogation.*—Voluntary works, besides, over and above God's commandments, which are called works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required ; whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

XII. *Of Sin after Justification.*—Not every sin willingly committed after justification is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after justification: after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and, by the grace of God, rise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as long as they live here; or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

XIII. *Of the Church.*—The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

XIV. *Of Purgatory.*—The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardon, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of scripture, but repugnant to the word of God.

XV. *Of speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People understand.*—It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the sacraments, in a tongue not understood by the people.

XVI. *Of the Sacraments.*—Sacraments, ordained of Christ, are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God's good will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called sacraments; that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have partly grown out of the *corrupt* following of the apostles—and partly are states of life allowed in the scriptures, but yet have not the like nature of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, because they have not any visible sign, or ceremony ordained of God.

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves condemnation, as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xi. 29.

XVII. *Of Baptism.*—Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and

mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church.

XVIII. *Of the Lord's Supper.*—The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of our Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means, whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

XIX. *Of both kinds.*—The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people; for both the parts of the Lord's Supper, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christians alike.

XX. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*—The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in the which it is commonly said, that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable, and dangerous deceit.

XXI. *Of the Marriage of Ministers.*—The ministers of Christ are not commanded by God's law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christians, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve best to godliness.

XXII. *Of the Rites and Ceremonies of Churches.*—It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike: for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whoso-

ever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the rites and ceremonies of the church to which he belongs, which are not repugnant to the word of God, and are ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like, as one that offendeth against the common order of the church, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren.

Every particular church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification.

XXIII. *Of the Rulers of the United States of America.*—The president, the congress, the general assemblies, the governors, and the councils of state, *as the delegates of the people*, are the rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the constitution of the United States, and by the constitutions of their respective states. And the said states are a sovereign and independent nation, and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.*

XXIV. *Of Christian Men's Goods.*—The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as some do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

XXV. *Of a Christian Man's Oath.*—As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ and James his apostle: so we judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

GOVERNMENT.

The government of this church, as its title imports, is episcopal. But that the reader may have a clear perception of the entire economy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the following analysis of its several parts is given:

1. There is the *society*, which includes all the members of the church attached to any particular place.

2. The *classes*, which originally consisted of about twelve persons

* As far as it respects civil affairs, we believe it the duty of Christians, and especially all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to the powers that be; and therefore it is expected that all our preachers and people, who may be under the British or any other government, will behave themselves as peaceable and orderly subjects.

each, but unhappily have often increased to from twenty to forty, meet together weekly for mutual edification, in singing, prayer, and exhortation.

3. The *class leader*, who is appointed by the preacher, has charge of a class, and it is his duty to see each member of his class once a week, to inquire how his soul prospers, and to receive what he is willing to give for the support of the church and poor.

4. The *stewards*, who are chosen by the quarterly meeting conference, on the nomination of the ruling preacher, have charge of all the money collected for the support of the ministry, the poor, and for sacramental services, and disburse it as the Discipline directs.

5. The *trustees* have charge of all the church property, to hold it for the use of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. These are elected by the people in those states where the law so provides, in other places as the Discipline directs.

6. There are the *exhorters*, who receive their license from the quarterly meeting conference, and have the privilege of holding meetings for exhortation and prayer.

7. A *preacher* is one who holds a license, and is authorized to preach, but not to baptize or administer the Lord's Supper. He may be either a travelling or local preacher. A local preacher generally follows some secular calling for a livelihood, and preaches on sabbath, and occasionally at other times, without any temporal emolument, except when he supplies the place of a travelling preacher. A travelling preacher devotes himself entirely to the work of the ministry, and is supported by the people among whom he labours. All these, after being recommended by the class to which they respectively belong, or by the leaders' meeting, receive their license from the quarterly meeting conference, signed by the presiding elder.

8. A *deacon* holds a parchment from a bishop, and is authorized, in addition to the discharging the duties of a preacher, to solemnize the rite of matrimony, to bury the dead, to baptize, and to assist the elder in administering the Lord's Supper. It is his duty, also, to seek after the sick and poor, and administer to their comfort.

9. An *elder* is ordained to that office by a bishop, assisted by several elders, and, besides doing the duties above enumerated, has full authority to administer all the ordinances of God's house. These generally, whenever a sufficient number of them can be had, have the charge of circuits or stations, and the administration of the several parts of Discipline.

10. A *presiding elder*, though no higher as to order than an elder, has charge of several circuits and stations, called collectively a dis-

trict. It is his duty to visit each circuit or station once a quarter, to preach, to administer the ordinances, to call together the travelling and local preachers, exhorters, stewards, and class leaders of the circuit or station for the quarterly meeting conference; and, in the absence of a bishop, to receive, try, suspend, or expel preachers, as the Discipline directs. He is appointed to his charge by the bishop.

11. A *bishop* is elected by the General Conference, and is responsible to that body for his official conduct, and is consecrated to that office by the imposition of the hands of three bishops, or by a bishop and several elders, or if there be no bishop living, by any three of the elders who may be appointed by the General Conference for that purpose. It is his duty to travel through the work at large, to superintend the temporal and spiritual affairs of the church, to preside in the Annual and General Conferences, to ordain such as may be elected by the annual conferences to the order of deacons or elders, and to appoint the preachers to their several circuits or stations.

12. A *leaders' meeting* is composed of the class leaders in any one circuit or station, in which the preacher in charge presides. Here the weekly class collections are paid into the hands of the stewards, probationers are received or dropped, as the case may be, inquiry is made into the state of the classes, delinquents are reported, and the sick and poor inquired after.

13. A *quarterly meeting conference* is composed of all the travelling and local preachers, exhorters, stewards, and leaders, belonging to any particular circuit or station, in which the presiding elder presides, or in his absence the preacher in charge. Here exhorters and preachers are licensed, preachers are recommended to an annual conference to be received into the travelling ministry, and also local preachers are recommended to the annual conference as suitable persons to be ordained deacons or elders; and likewise appeals are heard from any member of the church, who may appeal from a decision of a committee by whom he may have been tried for any delinquency.

14. An *annual conference* is composed of all the travelling preachers, deacons, and elders within a specified district of country. These are not legislative, but merely executive and judicial bodies, acting under rules prescribed for them by the General Conference. Here the character and conduct of all the travelling preachers within the bounds of the conference are examined yearly; applicants for admission into the travelling ministry, if accounted worthy, are admitted, continued on trial, or dropped, as the case may be; appeals of local preachers, which may be presented, are heard and decided;

and those who are eligible to deacon's or elder's orders are elected. An annual conference possesses an original jurisdiction over all its members, and may therefore try, acquit, suspend, expel, or locate any of them, as the Discipline in such cases provides.

15. The *General Conference* assembles quadrennially, and is composed of a certain number of delegates elected by the annual conferences. It has power to revise any part of the Discipline, or to introduce any new regulation, not prohibited by the following limitations and restrictions:

a. The General Conference shall not revoke, alter, or change our articles of religion, nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine.

b. They shall not allow of more than one representative for every fourteen members of the Annual Conference, nor allow of a less number than one for every thirty: provided, nevertheless, that when there shall be in any annual conference a fraction of two-thirds the number which shall be fixed for the ratio of representation, such annual conference shall be entitled to an additional delegate for such fraction: and provided also, that no annual conference shall be denied the privilege of two delegates.

c. They shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to do away episcopacy, or destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency.

d. They shall not revoke or change the General Rules of the United Societies.

e. They shall not do away the privileges of our ministers or preachers of trial by a committee, and of an appeal; neither shall they do away the privileges of our members of trial before the society, or by a committee, and of an appeal.

f. They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Charter Fund, to any purpose other than for the benefit of the travelling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, their wives, widows, and children. Provided, nevertheless, that upon the concurrent recommendation of three-fourths of all the members of the several annual conferences, who shall be present and vote on such recommendation, then a majority of two-thirds of the General Conference succeeding shall suffice to alter any of the above restrictions, except the first article; and also, whenever such alteration or alterations shall have been recommended by two-thirds of the General Conference, as soon as three-fourths of the members of all

the annual conferences shall have concurred as aforesaid, such alteration or alterations shall take place.

Under these limitations, the General Conference has full power to alter or modify any part of the Discipline, or to introduce any new regulation which the exigencies of the times may require; to elect the book-stewards, editors, corresponding secretary or secretaries of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and also the bishops; to hear and decide on appeals of preachers from the decisions of annual conferences; to review the acts of those conferences generally; to examine into the general administration of the bishops for the four preceding years; and, if accused, to try, censure, acquit, or condemn a bishop. The General Conference is the highest judicatory of the church.

SALARIES OF THE PREACHERS.

The amount allowed each preacher is one hundred dollars annually for himself, and his travelling expense; if married, one hundred dollars for his wife; sixteen dollars for each child under seven years of age, and twenty-four dollars a year for each child over seven and under fourteen years of age. In addition to this, the quarterly meeting conference of the circuit or station appoints a committee to estimate what farther allowance shall be made for furnishing fuel and table expenses for the family or families of preachers stationed among them.

The allowance to the bishops is the same. The committee to estimate the family expenses of the bishop is appointed by the annual conference within the bounds of which he may reside, and the amount thus allowed him is paid out of the avails of the Book Concern.

THE MANNER IN WHICH THEY ARE RAISED.

This is done by the voluntary contributions of the people among whom the preacher labours. For this purpose, a weekly class collection is made in all the classes, in which it is expected that every member will contribute something according to his or her ability; and also by a public collection in all the congregations once in three months; and to make up the deficiencies of those who labour in poor circuits, a yearly collection is made in every congregation, which is taken to the annual conference, and this, together with the avails of the Book Concern and Charter Fund, is divided among the several

claimants, including the disciplinary allowance of the bishops, the supernumerary, superannuated preachers, their widows and children.

FUNDS OF THE CHURCH.

The only funds of the church, beside that which is in the hands of the people, and which is drawn forth in voluntary contributions, are the avails of the Book Concern and the Charter Fund. The annual income of the Charter Fund is now \$1,360, and that of the Book Concern varies from \$17,000 to about \$27,000 a year. In 1841-2, it amounted to \$27,200, which is the largest sum ever realized in any one year, and in 1842-3, to \$17,000; and this amount is equally divided among thirty-four annual conferences, making from \$540 to \$840 to each conference; and this is again divided among the several claimants, amounting, probably, to over one thousand, giving from \$18 to \$28 to each claimant.

In addition to this, some of the annual conferences, at the centennial celebration of Methodism, in 1839, appropriated a portion of what was collected, as a Permanent Fund, the avails of which should be given to the superannuated preachers, the widows and orphans of preachers. The total amount of this money is not exactly known; but, as near as can be ascertained, the interest on the sums invested amounts to about \$1,300.

The avails of these funds are sacredly devoted for the relief of the most worthy objects, namely, the supernumerary and superannuated preachers, and to the widows and orphans of those men of God who have died in the work.

BOOK CONCERN.

At an early period of Mr. Wesley's ministry he established a printing office, under his own control, and in 1773 he commenced the publication of a monthly periodical called the *Arminian Magazine*, which was filled with a variety of useful matter, on theological, scientific, and biographical subjects. It has now reached its 65th volume, much enlarged from its original size, changing its name to the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, containing at the present time upwards of nine hundred octavo pages in each volume. This publication together with a variety of tracts and volumes on religious, scientific, and philosophic subjects, have done immense good to the community in Great Britain and other parts of the world; and the Wesleyan Connexion in England has produced some of the first

writers of the age, such as Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, Benson, Watson, and others, who have done much in spreading the light of truth by means of the press.

Soon after the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a similar establishment was commenced in this country, the first book being published in the year 1789, by the Rev. John Dickens, who was the first book-steward, and was at that time stationed in the city of Philadelphia, where the book business was begun. Its commencement was very small, for it had no capital to begin with, except about six hundred dollars, which John Dickens lent to the Concern, to enable it to commence its benevolent operations. It has gone on from that time, however, gradually increasing the number and variety of its publications, until it has reached its present enlarged dimensions. Its location is 200 Mulberry Street, in the city of New York.

The entire establishment is under the control of the General Conference, who elect the agents and editors, and appoint the Book Committee, to the general supervision of which, together with the general superintendence of the New York Conference, all its concerns are committed during the interval of the General Conference. Here are published a great variety of books on theological, historical, scientific, and philosophical subjects, Bibles and Testaments, commentaries upon the Holy Scriptures, a Quarterly Review, and a Weekly Religious Journal, Sunday School books, and tracts, all of which have an extensive circulation throughout the United States and Territories.

There is also a branch establishment at Cincinnati, Ohio, where all the works issued at New York are sold, some of which are re-published; two periodicals are issued, one monthly, called the Ladies' Repository, and the other weekly, called the Wesleyan Christian Advocate and Journal. These have a wide circulation, particularly in the Western States and Territories, and are doubtless doing much good.

In addition to these there are four weekly papers: one at Richmond, Va.; one at Charleston, S. C.; one at Nashville, Tenn., and another at Pittsburg, Pa., published under the patronage of the General Conference; and two others, one at Boston, Mass., and the other at Geneva, N. Y.; the former is published under the patronage of the New England, Providence, Maine, and New Hampshire Conferences, and the latter on its own responsibility. These, it is believed, are exerting a highly favourable influence on the community, in proportion to their circulation respectively, which, though not as large as the others, is very considerable.

The primary object of this book establishment, is identical with the preaching of the gospel, namely, to spread scriptural holiness over the land, by bringing sinners to the "knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus," and the building of believers "up in their most holy faith." Whatever pecuniary profits may arise from the sale of books, are devoted to the noblest of purposes, to the support of indigent and worn-out preachers, and the widows and orphans of those who have fallen in the itinerant field of labour. For this purpose was it established, and for this same benevolent purpose it is now kept in operation.

EDUCATION.

It is not to be supposed that a man of that expanded intellect by which Mr. John Wesley was distinguished, and who owed so much of his celebrity to the education which he received, first from his mother, and then from the academy, and which was completed at the University of Oxford, would be indifferent to the cause of education. Accordingly we find him, at an early period of his ministry, exerting himself in establishing a school at Kingswood, in the principles of Christianity, combining, as far as practicable, piety and knowledge together. This, though established at first chiefly for the benefit of the sons of itinerant preachers, has received youth from other sources, and has gone on prosperously to the present time; and the Wesleyan Methodists in England have added another, called Woodhouse Grove School, which is accomplishing the same benevolent and enlightened object; and finally they have established a theological institute, for the instruction of those young candidates for the Christian ministry, who are not immediately wanted in the itinerant ranks.

At the conference at which the Methodist societies in this country were organized into an independent church, a plan for the establishment of a college was adopted, and immediately after the adjournment of the conference, it was published; and Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury set themselves to work to carry it into effect by soliciting subscriptions, and selecting a site for the buildings. They finally succeeded in erecting a brick building, 80 feet in length and 40 in width, in the town of Abington, about 25 miles from the city of Baltimore, a spot of ground which gave a delightful and commanding view of the Chesapeake Bay, and of the country for twenty miles around. The college was opened for the reception of students on the 10th day of December, 1785, and continued in successful operation until the 7th of Decem-

ber, 1795, just ten years, lacking three days, when the whole was consumed by fire. A second, which was soon after erected in Baltimore, shared the same fate.

These calamitous circumstances attending their first efforts to establish a college, threw a damper over the minds of its friends, and indeed induced Bishop Asbury to think that the Methodists were not called to labour in the cause of education. The whole subject was therefore laid aside, except some ineffectual efforts to found some district schools, and the establishment of some charity schools, for more than twenty years. This general apathy in the cause of education, together with the fact that Methodist ministers were admitted into the Christian ministry without any specific literary qualifications, induced a belief in the public mind generally, that the Methodists were enemies, or at least indifferent to the cause of education; and it must be confessed that there was too much ground for this belief, as many certainly manifested, if not hostility, yet a great lukewarmness upon this subject.

This, however, was not the case with all. Some of the most pious and enlightened of the preachers and people mourned over this state of things, and they at last made an effort to rescue the church from this reproach. The first was made in 1817, by some friends in the city of Baltimore, who commenced a literary institution under the name of the "Asbury College;" but this soon went down, much to the disappointment and mortification of its friends and patrons. In 1817 an academy was established in New Market, under the patronage of the New England Conference, which succeeded and was finally removed to Wilberham, Mass., and it continues in successful operation to this day. In 1819 the Wesleyan Seminary was commenced in the city of New York, under the patronage of the New York Conference, which was finally removed to White Plains, and still continues to bless the rising generation with its instructions.

At the General Conference in 1820, the subject of education was referred to a committee, who made a spirited report in favour of the two academies already in operation, and recommended that all the annual conferences should adopt measures for the establishment of seminaries within their bounds. The adoption of this report by the General Conference, had a most happy effect in diffusing the spirit of education throughout its bounds. But still there were many obstacles to be removed, and apathy to be overcome, some manifesting an open hostility to the cause, while others looked on with cold indifference.

In 1823, Augusta College, in Kentucky, was commenced, and it has gone forward with various degrees of prosperity to this day.

In 1824 an academy was commenced at Cazenovia, New York State, under the patronage of the Oneida Conference, which has prospered from that day to this. In 1827, another was established at Readfield, Maine, under the patronage of the Maine Conference, on the manual labour system, and it has gone on successfully to the present time.

About the same time an academy was established in the bounds of the Mississippi Conference, which has done much to diffuse the spirit of education in that region of country.

The report which was adopted by the General Conference of 1828, in favour of education, did much to excite the friends of the cause to persevering diligence in this grand enterprise.

In 1831 three colleges were founded, namely: The Wesleyan University, located in Middletown, Connecticut; Randolph Macon College, in Boydston, Mecklenburgh county, Virginia; and La Grange, in North Alabama. These have all been thus far carried forward with success, though sometimes labouring under embarrassment for lack of adequate endowments.

In 1833, two other colleges were established, namely: Dickinson College, at Carlisle, Pa., and Allegheny College, in Meadville, Pa. They have both continued with various degrees of prosperity, but still need more funds to put them upon a permanent foundation.

Another academy was established about the same time at Lima, Livingston county, N. Y., which is still in a prosperous state.

In 1834, Lebanon College was founded at Lebanon, Illinois, under the patronage of the Illinois Conference, and it continues to prosper, though somewhat embarrassed for want of more ample endowments.

The Troy Conference Academy, located at Poultney, Vermont, was commenced the same year, and it has been carried forward with much success to the present time, though it is oppressed with a heavy debt, which the conference is exerting itself nobly to liquidate.

In 1835, a Classical Manual Labour School was commenced in Covington, Georgia, and another for the education of females, both of which are still in successful operation. In 1836, The Emery College was founded. These literary institutions are all under the patronage of the Georgia Conference.

In 1837, The Indiana Asbury University was commenced, and is still in operation. This was undertaken by the Indiana Conference.

The Amenia Seminary was established about this time. It is located in the town of Amenia, Dutchess county, New York, and it has very much prospered from that day to this.

Two, namely, Henry and Charles Colleges, were founded in 1839, under the patronage of the Holston Conference, and they are still prosecuting their labours with success.

In the same year, St. Charles College was commenced, under the patronage of the Missouri Conference, which promises much usefulness in that region of country.

The Cokesberg Manual Labour School, in the bounds of the South Carolina Conference, was begun about the same time.

Two academies were also commenced in 1839, one male, and the other female, in the bounds, and under the patronage of the New Jersey Conference; and the Newbury Seminary, and New Market Seminary, under the patronage of the New Hampshire Conference, were begun about the same time. These are all fulfilling the hopes of their friends. The Newbury Seminary has a theological department attached to it.

In 1841, the Transylvania University, in Lexington, Kentucky, was transferred to the Methodist Church, and is now in a prosperous condition.

These make no less than thirteen collegiate institutions, which are under the patronage of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. In addition to these a college has been commenced under favourable auspices in Rutersville, in the Republic of Texas, which has received a large endowment in land from the state, and it bids fair to be rendered a great blessing to that infant republic.

There are a number of academies besides those above enumerated, which are under Methodist influence, and which are so far patronized by the conferences, within the bounds of which they are located, that the conferences appoint boards of visitors, and recommend them to the patronage of their brethren and friends.

It will be seen by the above, that the Methodist Episcopal Church has made an effort to redeem herself from the reproach which had been cast upon her, not without some show of reason, of being indifferent to the cause of education. And if she shall exert her energies to sustain those institutions of learning which she has so nobly begun, by more ample endowments, she will do her part towards shedding on the youth of our land the blessings of sound knowledge and a liberal education. These, combined with experimental and practical piety, will tend to cement our Union more firmly together, and to raise us to honour and respectability among the nations of the earth.

BIBLE, SUNDAY SCHOOL, AND TEMPERANCE CAUSES.

In these benevolent enterprises, this church has taken an active part. She has a Sunday School Union of her own, in which she endeavours to do what she may in training up the youth entrusted to her care in the knowledge of the holy scriptures, and in the practice of piety and virtue. In addition to Sunday school books and tracts, and a Sunday school library, in which are found some of the choicest books in the English language in the various departments of knowledge, particularly adapted to youth, she prints *The Sunday School Advocate*, a semi-monthly periodical, well calculated to attract and instruct the youthful mind, and containing lessons suited to teachers and superintendents of sabbath schools.

In the great Bible cause, she unites her energies with the American Bible Society, many of her ministers being agents of this catholic and truly benevolent institution, and they have free access to her pulpits for the purpose of pleading its cause, and taking up collections for its support.

In the temperance reformation, as a church, she stands foremost in the ranks, always having made it a term of church-fellowship to abstain from "intoxicating liquors, unless in cases of necessity." And though this rule was somewhat relaxed in its practical effects, when the temperance reformation commenced, and though she did not immediately see the necessity of uniting with the American Temperance Society in all its plans of operation: yet, no sooner did she perceive that many of her members were indulging in moderate drinking, and that therefore there was a danger of their "running into the same excess of riot" with those who were gratifying their appetites with intoxicating drinks, than she lifted up her warning voice against the deadly poison, and united with all those who declared in favour of a total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors as a beverage; and it is believed that the pernicious practice is now nearly banished from the church, and hopes are entertained that soon it will be so entirely.

From the facts contained in the above brief view of the history, the doctrines, the government, and the usages of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it will be seen, I humbly trust, that she has contributed much towards the conversion of the world, and that, if permitted to go on in her career of usefulness to the souls and bodies of men, her ministers and members shall not be wanting, in that day when God shall "come to make up his jewels," in some share of that glory which shall be given to those "who turn many to righteousness."

STATISTICS.

The following table will show the increase or decrease, from year to year, of ministers and members, since the first conference held in America, in the year 1773. The number of travelling preachers includes the superannuated as well as effective.

Year.	Number of preachers.	Members.	Increase.	Decrease.
1773	10	1160		
1774	17	2073	913	
1775	19	3148	1075	
1776	24	4921	1773	
1777	36	6968	2047	
1778	29	6095		873
1779	49	8577	2482	
1780	42	8504		73
1781	54	10539	2025	
1782	59	11785	1246	
1783	83	13740	1955	
1784	83	14938	1248	
1785	104	18000	3012	

After this year the white and coloured members were returned in separate columns, and then the whole were added together, to make the sum total, which method will be followed hereafter.

Year.	Preachers.	Whites.	Coloured.	Total.	Increase.	Decrease.
1786	117	18791	1890	20681	2681	
1787	133	21949	3893	25842	5161	
1788	166	30809	6545	37354	11512	
1789	196	35019	8243	43262	5908	
1790	227	45949	11682	57631	14369	
1791	250	50385	12884	63269	5638	
1792	266	52109	13871	65980	2711	
1793	269	51416	16227	67643	1663	
1794	301	52794	13814	66608		1035
1795	313	48121	12170	60291		6317
1796	293	45384	11280	56664		3627
1797	262	46445	12218	58663	1999	
1798	267	47867	12302	60169	1506	
1799	272	49115	12236	61351	1182	
1800	287	51442	13452	64894	3543	
1801	307	57186	15688	72874	7980	

Year.	Preachers.	Whites.	Coloured.	Total.	Increase.	Decrease.
1802	358	68075	18659	86734	13860	3178
1803	383	81617	22453	104070	17336	
1804	400	89603	23531	113134	9064	
1805	433	95629	24316	119945	6811	
1806	452	103313	27257	130570	10625	
1807	516	114727	29863	144590	14020	
1808	540	121687	30308	151995	7405	
1809	597	131154	31884	163038	11043	
1810	636	139836	34724	174560	11522	
1811	668	148835	35732	184567	10007	
1812	678	156852	38505	195357	10790	
1813	700	171448	42859	214307	18950	
1814	687	168698	42431	211129		
1815	704	167978	43187	211165	36	
1816	695	171931	42304	214235	3070	
1817	716	181442	43411	224853	10518	
1818	748	190477	39150	229627	4774	
1819	812	201750	39174	240924	11297	
1820	896	219332	40558	259890	18966	
1821	977	239087	42059	281146	21256	
1822	1106	252645	44377	297022	15876	
1823	1226	267618	44922	312540	15518	
1824	1272	280427	48096	328523	15983	
1825	1314	298658	49537	348195	19672	
1826	1406	309550	51334	360884	12689	
1827	1576	327932	54065	381997	21113	
1828	1642	359533	59394*	418927	36930	
1829	1817	382679	65064	447743	39816	
1830	1900	402561	73592	476153	28410	
1831	2010	437024	76090	513114	36961	
1832	2200	472364	76229	548593	35470	
1833	2400	519196	80540	599736	51143	
1834	2625	553134	85650	638784	39048	
1835	2758	566957	85571	652528	13744	
1836	2929	564974	85271	650245		2283

This year and the subsequent years the number of local preachers were returned in the minutes of the conferences, and they are accordingly set down in a separate column in the years which follow :

* The number of Christian Indians are included in this and the subsequent number of coloured members.

Year.	Travel- ling Preachers.	Local Preachers.	Whites.	Coloured.	Total.	Increase.	Decrease.
1837	3147	4954	570123	79679	649802		1443
1838	3332	5792	615212	81337	696549	46747	
1839	3557	5856	650357	90102	740459	53910	
1840	3687	6339	698777	96668	795445	54986	
1841	3865	6893	748442	104476	852918	57473	
1842	4044	7144	803988	109913	913901	60983	
1843	4286	7730	936736	131789	1,068525	154624	

Add to these the travelling preachers (4266), which are not included in the above enumeration, and the grand total is 1,072811.

The above facts are taken from Wesley's Works, 7 vols. 8vo.; More's Life of Wesley, 1 vol. 8vo.; History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 4 vols. 12mo.; Asbury's Journal, 3 vols. 8vo.; Minutes of Conferences, 2 vols. 8vo.; Methodist Discipline, 1 vol. 24mo; and Original Church of Christ, 1 vol. 12mo.

METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH.

BY THE REV. JAMES R. WILLIAMS,

OF BALTIMORE.

AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF THE METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH.

THE Methodist Protestant Church comprises all the associated Methodist churches in these United States, and numbers, at the present time, Nov. 1842, sixty thousand communicants, thirteen hundred ministers and preachers, twenty-two annual conference districts, and possesses upwards of a half million of church property, acquired since her organization.

Her first General Convention, at which the church was regularly organized, was held in 1830, in the city of Baltimore, State of Maryland. There were in attendance at the convention eighty-three ministerial, and — lay representatives, from the following states: New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Ohio, New Jersey, and the District of Columbia. These represented about five thousand members of the respective associated Methodist churches, a large majority of whom had withdrawn from the Methodist Episcopal Church, on account of her government and hostility to a lay representation; she not only having withheld representation from the people, but actually *denied* that they have any right to representation. Moreover she had claimed for her itinerant ministry, exclusively, *as of divine right*, and without any authoritative control from the church, not merely the administration, but the sole right of expounding and maintaining, 1. *Gospel doctrines*, that is, a right to preach, and teach whatever they may please to admit into their creed as gospel doctrines. 2. *Ordinances*, that is, to set up whatever worship, sacraments, and services, they may deem conformable to the gospel; and 3. *Moral discipline*, that is, to admit and expel, censure and suspend, whomsoever they please in the church of God, and for whatever causes to them shall seem

meet. These unwarrantable claims were preceded and followed by the expulsion of nearly eighty ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in different parts of the United States, who advocated a change in the church government, and opposed the Popish claims of the itinerant ministers and bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The above cited claims and expulsions produced numerous secessions in different parts of the United States, and the organization of several annual conferences, of associated churches. These, respectively, elected their representatives, who assembled as above stated in the city of Baltimore, and framed a constitution and discipline for the government of the entire association. The basis on which the government is founded, embraces two very important particulars: *First*—"The Lord Jesus Christ is the only HEAD of the Church, and the word of God is the sufficient rule of faith and practice, in all things pertaining to godliness." *Secondly*—"A written constitution establishing the form of government, and securing to the ministers and members of the church, their rights and privileges, on an equitable plan of representation, is essential to, and the best safeguard of Christian liberty."

The constitution is preceded by a set of elementary principles, which may be viewed as a bill of rights. These bind the church to the laws of Christ; secure the rights of private judgment and the expression of opinion; protect church membership; declare the principles on which church trials shall be conducted, and guard against unrighteous excommunications; point out the residence of legitimate authority to make and enforce rules and regulations, for the proper and wholesome government of the church. The constitution recognises the rights and secures the interests of both ministers and laymen, and grants an equal representation to both. By this provision, made permanent under constitutional law, the entire association is fairly represented in the General Conference, which is the legislative department of the church. The executive, legislative, and judicial departments are kept distinct, and in each and all of them, the laity have their due weight, and equal power with the ministers. The government is, therefore, representative, and admirably balanced in all its parts.

The General Conference is assembled every fourth year, and consists of an equal number of ministers and laymen. The ratio of representation from each annual conference district, is, one minister and one layman for every thousand persons in full membership. This

body, when assembled, possesses power, under certain restrictions, to make such rules and regulations for the government of the whole church, as may be necessary to carry into effect the laws of Christ; to fix the compensation and duties of the itinerant ministers and preachers, and the allowance of their wives, widows, and children; and also the compensation and duties of the book agent, editor, &c., and to devise ways and means for raising funds, and to define and regulate the boundaries of the respective annual conference districts.

The respective annual conferences assemble annually, and are composed of all the ordained itinerant ministers; that is, all ministers properly under the stationing authority of the conference; and of one delegate from each circuit and station, within the bounds of the district, for each of its itinerant ministers. The annual conferences respectively are invested with power to elect a president annually—to examine into the official conduct of all their members—to receive by vote such ministers and preachers into the conference as come properly recommended by the quarterly conference of their circuit or station—to elect to orders those who are eligible and competent to the pastoral office—to hear and decide on appeals from the decisions of committees appointed to try ministers—to define and regulate the boundaries of circuits and stations—to station the ministers, preachers, and missionaries—to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to defray the expenses of the itinerant ministers and preachers and their families. The annual conferences, respectively, have authority to perform the following additional duties: 1st. To make such special rules and regulations as the peculiarities of the district may require; provided, however, that no rule be made inconsistent with the constitution—the General Conference to have power to annul any such rule. 2d. To prescribe and regulate the mode of stationing the ministers and preachers within the district; provided always, that they grant to each minister or preacher stationed, an appeal, during the sitting of the conference. And no minister or preacher to be stationed longer than three years, successively, in the same circuit, and two years, successively, in the same station. 3d. Each annual conference is clothed with power to make its own rules and regulations for the admission and government of coloured members within its district; and to make for them such terms of suffrage as the conferences may respectively deem proper. Each annual conference is required to keep a journal of its proceedings, and to send a copy to the General Conference.

The quarterly conferences are the immediate official meetings of the circuits and stations, and assemble quarterly, for the purposes of examining the official character of all the members, consisting of the trustees, ministers, preachers, exhorters, leaders and stewards of the circuit or station; to grant to persons properly qualified, and recommended by the class of which he is a member, license to exhort or preach; to recommend ministers and preachers to the annual conference to travel, and for ordination; and to hear and decide on appeals made by laymen from the decision of committees of trial.

The leaders' meeting is peculiar to stations, and is composed of the superintendent of the station, the stewards and the leaders. The superintendent is the minister who has the charge of the station. The stewards are appointed by the male members of the station to receive and disburse the collections made in the classes and the church. The leaders are elected by their respective classes, and represent them in the leaders' meeting. This meeting is the organ of reception of members into the church, and the dispenser of relief to the poor through the hands of the stewards. In the circuits, persons are received into full membership by vote of the society. Class leaders, stewards, trustees, exhorters, and private members, when charged with immorality or neglect of Christian duty, are duly notified by the superintendent, sufficient time being allowed to make preparation for their defence, and the right of challenge is granted to extend to any number of the committee not exceeding the whole number originally appointed. The committee of trial is appointed in the following manner. The superintendent nominates two persons in full membership and good standing, over the age of twenty-one years. The class, of which the accused is a member, nominates two more male members in like standing, those four persons select a fifth, and the five persons thus chosen, constitute a competent court of trial.

The above particulars constitute a brief sketch of the origin and system of the Methodist Protestant Church. She has progressed with an even steady pace, maintained peace in all her borders, and has contributed her share of usefulness towards the general good. As a seceding church from the Methodist Episcopal, she entertains no unfriendly feelings to that denomination of Christians. The doctrines taught by both churches, the means of grace and mode of worship being similar, the only difference lies in government: the Methodist Episcopal Church rejecting lay representation and adopting an unlimited episcopacy; while the Methodist Protestant Church admits lay representation and a parity in the ministry. These points

of difference, though very great, are deemed not sufficient to justify an alienation of Christian affection; therefore, the two churches are one in Christ Jesus, and are both labouring to promote the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom among men, and are to be viewed as two branches of the great Methodist family in Europe and in this country.

For further particulars, the reader is referred to the Discipline, to Williams's History of the Methodist Protestant Church, and to Samuel K. Jennings' "Exposition."

REFORMED METHODIST CHURCH.

BY REV. WESLEY BAILEY,
UTICA, NEW YORK.

THE writer, in the following article, can give but an outline, a brief and hasty sketch of the history of the body of Christians with which he stands connected, viz. : The Reformed Methodists. Want of time and documentary facts prevent, at this time, his laying before the public as extended and correct a view of this branch of the Methodist family, as he could wish for the excellent forthcoming "history of the whole Church."

The Reformed Methodists took their origin from a feeble secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the towns of Whitingham and Readsborough, Vermont, January 16th, 1814. We say *feeble* secession, because their entire number did not exceed fourteen persons, and these in no way distinguished for talent or learning; but were plain, unassuming mechanics and farmers, none of whom held any higher relation to the Methodist Episcopal Church, than that of local preachers and exhorters.

We trust the first Reformed Methodists entered upon the work of reform with lowliness of mind, and not through strife and vain-glory. They felt straitened in their religious rights and privileges under the Episcopal mode of church government. The gospel precept is: to "Esteem each other better than ourselves;" but they feared that this precept of humility, under the practice of the Episcopal mode of church government, had been lost sight of, and that this anti-democratic form of church organization tended to beget its own likeness on the hearts of the itinerant superintendents. And in order to regain, and, if possible give a more abiding effect to the true and free spirit of the gospel, which, in their belief, had been departed from in practice; to remove every inward and outward obstruction, and in hope of establishing rules of discipline and self-government more in conformity with the simple principles and primitive method prescribed in

the gospel: they felt themselves impelled by their conscientious scruples "to come out from creature bondage into the greater freedom of divine example." To evince to those with whom they had been on terms of fellowship that their motives were such as brethren and Christians should be governed by under these circumstances, they issued their manifesto of grievances, which, if not removed, presented no other alternative than that of separation. Failing in the hoped-for object, they on the 16th of January, 1814, met in convention at Readsborough; Elijah Bailey was called to the chair, and Ezra Amadon, chosen secretary.

At this convention they formed themselves into a church under the above name, and appointed a conference to be held on the following 5th of February, at which they adopted articles of religion and rules of church government. At this conference their number was somewhat increased. Wm. Lake, a local preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, united with them at this time; of him we shall speak in another place. Whether the government of an Episcopacy had obtained or was verging to the state and pageantry of ambassadors of pomp, instead of being ambassadors of bonds, or not; whether ministerial oppression and selfish affections were wasting the new covenant blessings, and all the gentle and unassuming influences of brotherly and loving kindness, one toward another, in godly fear—it is sufficient that they feared and believed it. With "fear and trembling" they entered upon the course they had chosen, in the hope that equality and union with each other, would bring the connexion into nearer and fuller union with Christ, the Head of the Church.

The Reformed Methodists hold the fundamental doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church. On the Trinity and the Sonship of Christ, they are with John Wesley, Fletcher, Benson, and Watson, and opposed to the views of Dr. Adam Clarke. Their articles of religion are few in number, embracing those points only peculiar to Methodism. Their system of church government is essentially Congregational in its character, all power being in the primary bodies, the churches, and delegated from time to time with a rigid accountability to the bodies by whom it is conferred.

The only point of religious faith which has distinguished the Reformed Methodists, from other branches of the same family, is perhaps, the *extent* which some of our leading men have given to faith and its operations. They have held and taught that the same faith now, would produce the same effects it did in primitive times. That the lapse of ages cannot render void the promises of God, or a living faith in Christ powerless, whether such faith be exerted with respect to

the temporal or spiritual wants of man. And while some of the more "orthodox" have regarded the "Reformers as fanatics," on this point, they (the Reformers) have considered the charge as having its origin in their own infidelity and unbelief. They have believed that the church has apostatized; that as all blessings given in answer to prayer are suspended upon the condition of faith, that therefore faith is the restoring principle. They dare not limit faith, except by a "thus saith the Lord." They have not been enabled to see from the records of truth any limitations interposed since apostolical times, and hence they conclude that we may now, in this age, pray for the removal of temporal as well as spiritual diseases; and that "according to their faith, it will be done unto them."

It is not our object to discuss this point, but it is proper that we should notice it as a characteristic of the Reformed Methodists, a point for which they have suffered reproach; but how justly we leave others to judge. In leaving the Methodist Episcopal Church, they aimed at a reform extending farther and deeper than the external organization of the church—to a reform that should infuse new vitality and living faith into the body. That God has heard the prayer of faith, and raised up the sick among them in numerous instances, is what they most firmly believe, and is to them a subject of devout thanksgiving to his blessed name. That those holding and preaching this doctrine should be liable to extravagances is quite obvious; and we frankly confess, that in some instances the truth may have been blamed by the unskilfulness with which some of the Reformed Methodists have treated this subject. But we believe that unbelief has been the damning sin of the church, and that it is far better to believe too much than too little; better to become a "fanatic" in faith and love, than be the heartless worshipper of a God, as ruthless as the rocks, and as merciless as the waves—a God who has tied himself up by physical laws, which govern him as arbitrarily as they do the universe of matter. So much for the "fanaticism" of the Reformed Methodists. Let it be placed upon the record of time—let it be placed upon the records of eternity, as a point in their faith, a trait in their religious sentiments.

If the Reformed Methodists have steadfastly insisted upon any one point of the gospel more than another, it is the doctrine of the attainableness of entire sanctification in this life, through faith in the all-atoning blood of Jesus Christ. Indeed, they have regarded the disbelief of this great truth, and the consequent neglect to seek for the blessings, as the primary cause of the disbelief of the sentiment above noticed,—sanctification, which cleansing the heart from all sin, and bringing the whole soul into communing with him, naturally begets

faith in God, as a living God; and the clear and the abiding conviction that God is faithful to one promise, naturally leads to confidence in all his promises.

The Conditions of Fellowship and Membership.—The Reformed Methodists hold these as the same, or make them run parallel in admitting members to their societies. The “fruits of righteousness witnessed by taking up the cross and following Christ,” says the Discipline, “shall be the only test of Christian fellowship.” All who “walk according to this rule,” are, on application, received into the church; its ministers are required to subscribe to their articles of religion, but persons are received to membership on the simple test of their experience, without requiring an assent to all the doctrines of the Discipline. The Church of Christ is a spiritual body. They are made one, brought into spiritual sympathy, not by the letter of a creed, or by the subscribing to certain doctrines, but by the Spirit of God. Hence the Reformed Methodists hold that a union of spirit should be made indispensable to a union of Christians in visible church bonds; and when that union is broken, the spirit of love departed, then there should be a dissolution of the connexion. Consequently, the Reformed Methodists hold that the door out of the Church should be the same as into it—that as evidence of sins forgiven and heart renewed, is the only condition of admission to the church, so the want of these continued fruits is regarded as sufficient occasion for expulsion. They believe this term of church membership is the only one on which a living spiritual church can be maintained. Their views of Christian fellowship are equally liberal with respect to other Churches. They hold that all of the children of God have a right to all the ordinances of God’s house in all places of his people—and that no rite dependent on human sanction, can lawfully bar a Christian from the table of the Lord. Baptism is administered to all, according to their consciences, and enforced upon none, and in no case made a test of church-fellowship.

POLITY OF THE REFORMED METHODIST CHURCH.

That the polity of the Reformed Methodist Church may be the better understood, we shall examine it under three different heads.

1. *The Church.*—The local churches are regarded as the origin of power. All officers in the church must derive their authority from the people, either by a direct election or by their delegates chosen for the expressed purpose. A number of believers may ordain for themselves elders or bishops, and do all things necessary to constitute

themselves a church of Christ. Acting upon this principle in the infancy of their organization, the Reformed Methodist connexion set apart a few of their number by prayer and the laying on of the hands of a committee, to the office of elder. They hold this as a right which a local church may, in cases of necessity, exercise—but still as a prudential regulation, have placed the ordination of elders in the hands of the annual conferences. Churches are divided into classes according to their numbers, with a leader for each class, chosen by themselves. The churches have the right of selecting their own ministers, the ministers the right of selecting their own fields of labour, without the interference of a higher foreign or central power, and this with respect to length of time and salary.

The Annual Conferences.—An annual conference is composed of delegates from all the churches in a given district, the number of delegates from each church or circuit being proportioned to their numbers. Ministers may be chosen delegates, but are not delegates by virtue of their office. The object of the annual conference is to transact business which equally interests all the local, primary bodies—such as the examination of preachers as to their moral character, gifts and usefulness, the ordination of elders, the provision of ways and means for missionary operations, the support of feeble and destitute churches, and general objects of common interest. These conferences are held annually, and ordinarily hold their session three or four days. The annual conference has power to withdraw fellowship from a disorderly church, but no power to interfere with the internal affairs of any church, except for unchristian conduct. At the annual conference circuits are sometimes formed, and preachers engaged to supply them; but conference has no power to station a preacher contrary to his own, and the wishes of the people. Ordination is performed by a committee of elders chosen by the annual conference, the candidates for orders first being elected to orders by the annual conference.

The General Conference.—The General Conference is composed of delegates from the annual conferences, the number of delegates from the annual conferences in proportion to their respective numbers of their church members. The General Conference has power to revise the Discipline under certain limitations. It can pass no rule giving to preachers power over the people, except such as belongs to them as ministers of the word. The alterations in Discipline must, before they go into effect, first be recommended by three-fourths of the annual conferences, or after the General Conference has passed upon them, receive their ratification. General Conferences are held at the call of annual conferences, not periodically, and the delegates to them are

chosen at the session of the annual conferences next preceding the General Conference.

Such is the outline of the articles of religion and church polity of the Reformed Methodist Church. We pass next to a brief notice of their progress. And here we would premise, that a cause however good, and principles however wisely adapted to an end, cannot progress without an appropriate instrumentality. The first Reformed Methodists had not money, and as for talent, however good it might have been in its uncultivated state, they had not the refinement of the schools of learning or divinity with which to command attention. They were poor men, men with families dependent upon their own hands for bread, living among the peaks of the Green Mountains. However, some of them by application have become able ministers of the New Testament. Of the original number of the seceders, four have been regarded as leading men in the denomination, and have contributed much by their devotion and self-denial to raise up and perpetuate this body of reformers.

Elijah Bailey, father of the writer, was a native of the town of Douglas, Mass., but immediately after his matrimonial alliance with Miss Lydia Smith, removed to the town of Readsborough, Vt.; this mountainous region being then the Elysium of the "Far West," to the people of Massachusetts. He was accompanied by his brother, James Bailey, and Ezra Amadon, his brother-in-law, both of whom in course of time became useful preachers of the Reformed Methodist Church.

Elijah Bailey was a young man of sober habits, of a contemplative turn of mind, but indebted to a few weeks in the common school of his times for his education; to which should be added the instructions received from his grandfather Phillips, a man of great soundness of moral principle and variety and richness of maxims of law and morality, with whom Mr. Bailey passed the greater portion of his juvenile years. Being bred a Congregationalist, he knew not the power of godliness, though a strict observer of its form, until the Methodist preachers came into Vermont. He was among the first fruits of their labours; was awakened, convicted, and received into their society, and continued an acceptable member of the Methodist Episcopal Church up to the year 1814. In this wilderness country he became the father of eleven children, whom he reared by the sweat of his own brow, from the products of a small Green Mountain farm, and the trade of a cooper. He was a staunch Jeffersonian in politics, was for sixteen years justice of the peace of the town of Readsborough, and at the same time a member of the assembly from that town. In the legislature of that state those lessons of democracy, early inculcated,

were more clearly explained and more firmly fixed; and it is to this course of mental and moral training that he was afterwards led to question the justice of the Methodist Episcopal form of church government, and ably to defend religious democracy, not only from the genius of Christianity, and the precepts of the New Testament, but from the inalienable rights of man. Up to the time of the secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church, he was but a local preacher, and was severely opposed by his family connexions for attempting to exercise the ministry of the word without a regular course of literary and theological training. But immediately after the organization of the Reformed Methodist Church he was ordained elder, an office which he has continued to fill up, to the present time; travelling extensively, exposing himself to the inclemency of all seasons of the year, and that, too, with no other pecuniary compensation than such as friends from time to time might contribute. To his self-denying labours, labours unrequited except with spiritual blessings upon his own soul, is the cause of Reformed Methodism indebted, as much, if not more than to any other one. Although past forty-five years of age before he entered upon an itinerant life, few men have travelled more extensively in preaching the gospel, in the regions between Cape Cod on the east, Ohio on the west, Canada on the north, and Pennsylvania on the south.

James Bailey, brother of Elijah, has likewise occupied a conspicuous place in the progress of this branch of Methodists. In preaching talent, though inferior to Elijah Bailey, and not so well versed in the conference business and the exposition of intricate questions, he is a sound divine, and will doubtless have many souls as seals of his ministry in the great day of accounts. He is a man of indomitable perseverance, always laborious and never discouraged; more local in his labours, with a wife who has been confined to her sick room for nearly forty years; to him the cause is indebted for some of its best societies in central New York.

Ezra Amadon, another of the original seceders, is, in the true sense of the word, a nursing father. Of strict integrity and universal love for the cause, surrounded by a large family connexion, he has been a pillar in the cause of reform in western New York. His words are always few and to the point, his counsels safe and conciliatory, he enjoys himself best when servant of all, and the instrument of good; a truly great man in the affections of his acquaintances, but of humble pretensions.

Ebenezer Davis was likewise of the original fourteen who organized the Reformed Methodist Church. He is, we think, a native of Ver-

mont, still resident in that state, and has stood from the beginning as one of the pillars of the cause in the Vermont Conference. He is a self-made man, like his coadjutors above alluded to, and from a boy, indeed, has become a man in the things of God; wise in council, and of universal integrity and Christian simplicity.

William Lake gave his name, his heart, his hand to the cause of Methodist reform, at the first conference. He was a native of White Creek, N. Y., of Low Dutch descent, and inherited all the roughness of character peculiar to that class of our citizens in this state. Previous to his conversion he was a gambler, a horse-jockey, boxer, &c., a rare specimen of a man to look up, of an ardent temperament, hasty and undaunted in any thing he undertook. After his conversion, his ardour, zeal, and physical energies, were all turned into a new channel. He was as zealous for God and the salvation of souls, as he had before been the devoted of all unrighteousness. Having much of the "good things of this life," he brought not only his own personal services to the aid of the cause, but by his money did much to sustain his poorer brethren. He has some two years since gone to his long-sought rest. He was a man distinguished for the power of his exhortations, more than the richness and correctness of his sermons. In the prime of his years, the sinner trembled under the eloquence of spirit with which he spoke. Few persons ever stormed the bulwarks of iniquity with more undaunted courage and better success. He could accomplish what could be effected by zeal, and moral and physical force, better than that which required prudence and discrimination. He was an illiterate man, but acquired an easy use of the English language, and was a fine specimen of natural eloquence. He travelled extensively, was itinerant in his feelings, and in the prime of his years revivals uniformly followed his labours. He travelled a few times into the State of Massachusetts, where his boisterous zeal very much shocked the puritanic habits of the people; but the greater portion of his ministry was spent in Vermont, New York, and Upper Canada. His family residence was Granby, N. Y., for the last twenty years of his life. Pecuniary embarrassments greatly depressed him in the latter part of his days, and to a considerable degree impaired his usefulness; but thousands will bless his memory, and appear as stars in his crown of rejoicing at the last day.

Caleb Whiting deserves likewise to be noticed as one of the original band. Soon after the organization of the Reformed Methodist Church he removed to this state, and has been extensively useful as a minister of Jesus Christ in central New York. He has been dis-

tinguished more for the power of his exhortations than for his preaching talent, though he has held the office of an elder from the beginning, and is worthily regarded as a father in the cause. Elder Whiting is now superannuated, and resides at Berkshire, Tioga county, N. Y.

The six persons above alluded to, are regarded as fathers in the cause of Reformed Methodism, and have been the leading instruments in the progress of this body of Methodists; their history is interwoven with the history of the church with which they stand connected. Other brethren of great merit and usefulness have come in to their aid, which the limits of this article will not allow us to notice. Rev. Pliny Brett, of Mass., early united with the Reformers, and his self-denial and love for souls have done much for the cause in that state. But he, several years since, left us and joined the Protestant Methodists. Rev. Seth Sterling, of Vermont, a man of God, whose praise is in all the church, likewise united with this church while in her infancy, and still lives, an ornament to the Christian name. Rev. Jeremiah Fry, of the Green Mountain State, born a Reformed Methodist, is one of the most talented ministers, though self-made, of any in the Vermont Conference. Rev. Messrs. Dunham, Snow, and Harris, of Mass., reared up among the Reformers, are able ministers of the New Testament.

At the present time we have five conferences of Reformed Methodists: the Massachusetts, Vermont, New York, New York Western, and Canada Conferences, and about fifty ordained preachers or elders, and twenty-five licensed preachers. The memberships are computed at 3,000.

Of the progress of the cause in Vermont, I need not farther speak. The year of the close of the war, with a view to thrust labourers into the field, a sort of community was formed, Wm. Lake, E. Bailey, E. Davis, E. Amadon, and several others being members of it. They bought a farm on the state line in the town of Bennington, Vt., and Hosack, N. Y. This farm consisted of several hundred acres, and the community, of near a dozen farmers. Providence did not seem to smile on the undertaking, though conceived in the purest benevolence. The cold season's coming on, the want of funds to pay in advance for the farm, rendered it impossible for them to pay for the place, and after remaining near two years on the premises, they were compelled to scatter; not scattered to abandon their principles, but to promulgate them in other regions, where Providence might open the way. Rev. E. Bailey removed to Slatersville, R. I., in which place he laboured two years, and then removed to Onondaga, N. Y. For

eighteen years his family remained in Manlius, Onondaga, while he himself was itinerating from Cape Cod to Ohio. About ten years ago he removed to Cape Cod, Mass., at which place he has laboured since that time, and where he still resides; in the 77th year of his age, though capable of sustaining a pastoral charge. He has frequently remarked, that preaching was to him a healthful exercise. This is owing, no doubt, to the natural, easy mode of speaking which he had acquired, and the self-control he had obtained over himself; so that he was always cool and collected, his zeal the effect of the flow of spirit, and not a laboured effort for effect, against the impulses of his own heart. He is emphatically a man of integrity, and steady devotion to God.

Rev. Wm. Lake, soon after the community was dissolved, removed to the town of Granby, N. Y., where his family still resides; and from this central point travelled extensively, and was eminently useful in planting and watering the Reformed Methodist societies in this state. He was unlike the Rev. E. Bailey in the temperament of his mind and gifts; but for several years, when the providence of God opened the way for them to labour together, they most harmoniously drew together, as true yoke-fellows, and scarcely did they strike a blow, but that a powerful revival attended the effort. He was indeed "a son of thunder," whose powerful appeals touched the most stony heart.

Failing in the "community" project, tended no doubt to subserve the cause which they had so nearly at heart. They were scattered, and in their scattered condition have accomplished more than they would have done if confined to one spot as a centre of operations. This attempt to build up a permanent community was an unwise move, and is now universally so regarded by the persons interested. So the fathers think; and some of their sons, now that property associations and communities are heralded as the sovereign panacea of the ills of human society, look back to that time with an instinctive dislike to such schemes for human improvement.

Reformed Methodism was planted in Upper Canada by the Rev. Messrs. Wm. Lake and E. Baily, some time in 1817 or 1818. Here they soon found faithful co-labourers in the persons of Rev. Messrs. Robert and Daniel Perry. The history of the revival which followed their first labours in this province would be most instructive, affording one of the most interesting instances, of the conversion of hardened sinners, found in modern history of revivals. Instances of slaying power were common. Infidels feared and trembled in view of the manifest tokens of the divine presence.

In the state of New York, worthy co-labourers soon came to the aid of "the fathers," whose piety and devotion have placed them high in the affections of the people with which they stand connected. But our limits will not allow us to notice them particularly.

The Reformed Methodists, up to the year 1837, laboured under the inconvenience of having no periodical organ. In the year 1837 the "South Cortland Luminary" was started, edited by the writer. This paper was started by the New York Conference, but was soon made the organ of the whole church. The press in the year 1839 was removed to Fayetteville, N. Y., and took the name "Fayetteville Luminary," edited as before. In the fall of 1841 an association was formed between the Reformed Methodists, Society Methodists, and local bodies of Wesleyan Methodists, the object of which was to aid each other, without merging the various bodies in one church. By the terms of this association, the name of the Luminary was changed to that of "Methodist Reformer," the Reformer to be the organ of the association, but still the press to be the property of the Reformed Methodists. The Reformer was started in Fayetteville, but removed to Utica, in the fall of 1842; and after the organization of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, May, 1843, by an arrangement between the Reformed Methodists and the Wesleyans, on the association principle, the Reformer subscription list was transferred to the True Wesleyan, published at Boston, Massachusetts, as a preliminary step to a union of the two bodies. Six years only of the time of the existence of the Reformed Methodist body, they had the advantages of the press. Rev. E. Bailey had, however, written two works, one "Bailey on the Trinity," and "Thoughts on Government," previous to this.

The Reformers are still distinct in their organization, but bound to the Wesleyan Methodists by the ties of sympathy in principle and mode of church polity, and likewise by an association which secures mutual advantages, and it is contemplated that at no distant day, they will be lost in the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

Such is but a meagre outline of the history of this body of Methodists. It has often been tauntingly said, "Why, you Reformers have done nothing!" We have, truly, nothing of which to boast. But considering the material with which they commenced, the number, men, want of schools and an educated ministry, the opposition which a body must meet that has the plainness to intimate that the Methodist Episcopal Church *needs reforming*, and the actual opposition, to say nothing of outright slander from that quarter: the wonder is greater that they have done as much as they have. The actual number in a denomination is not the true standard of the good they are

accomplishing. The Reformers have been the instruments of the conversion of thousands who, in consequence of their itinerant habits, have sought a home in other churches. One whole conference went off in Ohio, and joined the Methodist Protestant Church. Some ten years since, more than one half of the ministers of the Massachusetts Conference, and several societies, seceded, and joined the Protestant Methodists. Then, again, it requires some humility and attachment to principle to induce men to stand long with a small and persecuted people. Reformers have had seceders from them—I will not call them apostates—and all these things taken into the account, we have abundant reason to thank God that our labour has not been altogether in vain.

I might have added, under the head of “articles of religion,” that the Reformed Methodist Church has always had an article against war, offensive and defensive. I add it here, for I have aimed to give every “radical” as well as “fanatical” trait in the history of this people. For if the public have any interest in the history of this branch of the Church of Christ, they are most interested in those portions wherein they differ from others. And surely, we need be ashamed of nothing but our sins. And I must add another fact: it might be expected that a body formed upon the democratical principle of the Reformed Methodist Church would be anti-slavery in its character. The Reformed Methodists have from the beginning had Mr. Wesley’s general rule with respect to “buying or selling, men, women and children, with an intention to enslave them,” and not that *spurious* interpolated one now in the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and when the recent anti-slavery discussion sprung up, this body was prompt to respond to this effort to rid the church and country of this “sum of all villanies.” They soon added an article to the Discipline, excluding *apologists* for this sin against “God, man, and nation,” from the church. And we are happy to add, that they have great harmony on this question.

In conclusion, Mr. Editor, I shall thank you for allowing space in your History of the whole Church, for transmitting to posterity the brief record of this body of Christians which I have furnished; but the haste with which it has been written, and amidst the pressing cares which at present devolve upon me, and the want of statistics and records, I must beg to urge as an apology for deficiencies.

TRUE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH.

BY REV. J. TIMBERMAN,

PASTOR OF THE FIRST TRUE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH, CITY OF NEW YORK.

THE polity of the original Wesleyan societies rested upon the principle that their illustrious founder had a right to control every minister and preacher, and every member of his societies, in all matters of a prudential character. As he himself states, he had the exclusive power to appoint, when, where and how, his societies should meet; and to remove those whose lives showed that they had no desire to flee the wrath to come; and this power remains the same, whether the people meeting together were eight hundred or eight thousand. He exercised a similar power over the preachers, to appoint each, when, where and how to labour, and to tell any, "If I see causes, I do not desire your help any longer." Mostly, the members of these societies were members of the Church of England; some were members of the dissenting churches. Mr. Wesley was a minister of the Church of England, and as such he died; and with very few exceptions, his preachers were laymen. He was their tutor and governor. He was the patron of all the Methodist pulpits in England and Ireland for life: the sole right of nomination being vested in him by the deeds of settlement. He was also the patron of the Methodist societies in America, and as such, he is acknowledged by the Methodist Episcopal Church as its founder. That he is the author of the Episcopacy of that church, is questioned by some for the following reasons: 1st. It was not until some years after the institution of Episcopacy in 1784, that Mr. Wesley's authority was alleged as its basis. But without any mention of Mr. Wesley, the itinerant preachers declared in their first minutes: "We will form ourselves into an Episcopal Church," &c. 2d. Mr. Wesley alleged no other authority than himself to ordain ministers, but his right as a presbyter. 3d. He solemnly forbid Mr. Asbury to assume the title of bishop in his letter to Mr. Shinn, dated London, Sept. 20th, 1788, in which he says: "One instance of this, your greatness, has given me great

concern. How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called a bishop? I shudder at the very thought. Men may call me a man, or a fool, or a rascal, or a scoundrel, and I am content; but they shall never, with my consent, call me a bishop. For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this." Signed, John Wesley.

4th. Some of the first symptoms indicative of dissatisfaction with the new economy were evinced by those preachers, who were well acquainted with Mr. Wesley's sentiments on this subject, and had themselves been made to feel the tremendous power of this economy among Methodists, namely, Episcopacy. On no question have they been so equally divided. No changes, however, have been effected. The Episcopacy still maintains its prerogatives in their original integrity. In 1824, memorials and petitions were presented to the General Conference, complaining of the government being so constituted and administered, as to exclude the local preachers and the lay members from every sort of participation in their own government, as Methodists. But some of these petitioners were satisfied with the plea of expediency; still the most of them took the ground of right. All of them claimed a representative form of government. The Conference replied, that they knew no such right, nor did they comprehend any such privileges. From that time the controversy assumed a new character, the result of which was the call of a convention of all Methodist families, to a representative form of church government, to be held at Baltimore, Maryland, in November, 1828. Here, a provisional government, under the formal articles of association, was adopted, to continue for two years; after which, another convention was also held in Baltimore, and continued its sessions from the 2d to the 23d of November, 1830. One hundred and twelve persons were elected as members, eighty-one of whom attended. A constitution and discipline were adopted; called, "the Constitution and Discipline of the Protestant Methodist Church." In this, much contemplated by Reformed Methodists was gained, and prosperity greatly attended said church. But many things contemplated by True Wesleyans were not yet gained; for the true founder of Wesleyan Methodism was not only opposed to the Episcopal form of church government, as it exists in America among the Methodists, but also to slavery as it exists in this country. And yet this vile system is cherished by both Episcopal and Protestant Methodists; therefore, both churches are still agitated by those who were not one in sentiment upon Episcopacy and slavery. True Wesleyans and some of the chief men are engaged in this latter reform with Mr. Hervey, who calls this system of slavery the vilest system ever seen beneath the sun. In the Me-

thodist Episcopal Church, were Rev. Leroy Sunderland, Orange Scott, Luther Lee, J. Horton, E. Smith, C. Prindle, &c. In the Protestant Methodist Church, were Rev. John Crocker, Hiram Mackee, R. McMurdy, G. Pegler, Dr. Timberman, J. Culver, &c. These, with a host of others from different associated Methodist Churches, united in calling a convention of ministers and laymen, for the purpose of forming a Wesleyan Methodist Church, free from Episcopacy, intemperance and slavery; which convention was held at Utica, New York, on May 31st, 1843. And after many days' peaceful deliberation, the glorious design of this convention was accomplished, viz., the formation of a Discipline, called "the Discipline of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in America," granting to all men their rights, and making them free and equal, according to the word of God and the preamble of the Declaration of Independence of these United States. They also organized six annual conferences, including the chief portions of the Northern and Eastern States, connected with which, are many interesting societies, and talented ministers and preachers, which number about twenty thousand members, and about three hundred itinerant ministers and preachers, besides a greater number of unstationed ministers and preachers. Thus much for the history of this branch of the Church of Christ. We now come to notice secondly, the doctrines of the True Wesleyan Methodist Church.

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES.

1. A Christian church is a society of believers in Jesus Christ, assembled in any one place for religious worship, and is of divine institution.

2. Christ is the only Head of the Church; and the word of God the only rule of faith and conduct.

3. No person who loves the Lord Jesus Christ, and obeys the gospel of God our Saviour, ought to be deprived of church membership.

4. Every man has an inalienable right to private judgment, in matters of religion; and an equal right to express his opinion, in any way which will not violate the laws of God, or the rights of his fellow-men.

5. Church trials should be conducted on gospel principles only; and no minister or member should be excommunicated except for immorality, the propagation of unchristian doctrines, or for the neglect of duties enjoined by the word of God.

6. The pastoral or ministerial office and duties are of divine appoint-

ment, and all elders in the Church of God are equal; but ministers are forbidden to lord it over God's heritage, or to have dominion over the faith of the saints.

7. The church has a right to form and enforce such rules and regulations only, as are in accordance with the holy scriptures, and may be necessary, or have a tendency, to carry into effect the great system of practical Christianity.

8. Whatever power may be necessary to the formation of rules and regulations is inherent in the ministers and members of the church; but so much of that power may be delegated from time to time, upon a plan of representation, as they may judge necessary and proper.

9. It is the duty of all ministers and members of the church to maintain godliness, and to oppose all moral evil.

10. It is obligatory on ministers of the gospel to be faithful in the discharge of their pastoral and ministerial duties; and it is also obligatory on the members to esteem ministers highly for their work's sake, and to render them a righteous compensation for their labours.

ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

I. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.*—There is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness: the Maker and Preserver of all things visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son (the Word), and the Holy Ghost.

II. *Of the Son of God.*—The only begotten Son of God was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men, and to reconcile us to God.

III. *Of the Resurrection of Christ.*—Christ did truly rise again from the dead, taking his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until He shall return to judge all men at the last day.

IV. *Of the Holy Ghost.*—The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

V. *The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.*—The holy scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought necessary or requisite to salvation. In the name of the

holy scriptures, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority there is no doubt in the Church.

The canonical books of the Old Testament are: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the First Book of Samuel, the Second Book of Samuel, the First Book of Kings, the Second Book of Kings, the First Book of Chronicles, the Second Book of Chronicles, the Book of Ezra, the Book of Nehemiah, the Book of Esther, the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Songs of Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

The canonical books of the New Testament are: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, the Acts, the Epistle to the Romans, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First Thessalonians, Second Thessalonians, First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, James, First Peter, Second Peter, First John, Second John, Third John, Jude, Revelation.

VI. *Of the Old Testament.*—The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind through Christ, who is the only mediator between God and man, wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching rites and ceremonies, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the ten commandments, which are called the moral law.

VII. *Of Relative Duties.*—Those two great commandments which require us to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, and our neighbour as ourselves, contain the sum of the divine law, as it is revealed in the scriptures, and are the measure and perfect rule of human duty, as well for the ordering and directing of families and nations and all other social bodies, as for individual acts, by which we are required to acknowledge God as our only supreme ruler, and all men created by Him, equal in all natural rights. Wherefore all men are bound so to order all their individual and social acts, as to render to God entire and absolute obedience, and to secure all men the enjoyment of every natural right, as well as to promote the greatest happiness of each in the possession and exercise of such rights.

VIII. *Of Original or Birth Sin.*—Original sin standeth not in following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the cor-

ruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is wholly gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

IX. *Of Free Will.*—The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ working in us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.

X. *Of the Justification of Man.*—We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.

XI. *Of Good Works.*—Although good works, which are the fruit of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's judgments: yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch as by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

XII. *Of Sin after Justification.*—Not every sin willingly committed after justification, is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable; wherefore, repentance is not denied to such as fall into sin after justification; after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God, rise again to amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, who say they can no more sin, as long as they live here; or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

XIII. *Of Sacraments.*—Sacraments ordained of Christ are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but they are certain signs of grace, and God's good will toward us, by which he doth work invisibly in us and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord, in the gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of our Lord.

XIV. *Of Baptism.*—Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church.

XV. *Of the Lord's Supper.*—The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one

to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, it is made a medium through which God doth communicate grace to the heart.

XVI. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished on the Cross.*—The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption and propitiation for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore, to expect salvation on the ground of our own works, or by suffering the pains our sins deserve, either in the present or future state, is derogatory to Christ's offering for us, and a dangerous deceit.

XVII. *Of the Rites and Ceremonies of Churches.*—It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be alike; for they have always been different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Every particular church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification.

XVIII. *Of the Resurrection of the Dead.*—There will be a general resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust, at which time the souls and bodies of men will be reunited, to receive together a just retribution for the deeds done in the body.

XIX. *Of the General Judgment.*—There will be a general judgment at the end of the world, when God will judge all men by Jesus Christ, and receive the righteous into his heavenly kingdom, where they shall be for ever secure and happy; and adjudge the wicked to everlasting punishment suited to the demerit of their sins.

STATISTICS OF THE TRUE WESLEYAN CHURCH.

Boundaries of Annual Conferences.—1. The New England Conference comprises the New England States, except that portion of Vermont west of the Green Mountains. In the bounds of this conference are contained thirty-four circuits and congregations, and nineteen ministers.

2. Champlain Conference includes that part of Vermont west of the Green Mountains; that part of New York State which lies north and east of Black river, and a line running from Carthage to the west corner of Vermont. This conference contains at present nine stations and eleven ministers.

3. New York Conference comprises so much of New York as is not included in the Champlain Conference, Eastern Pennsylvania,

and New Jersey. In this conference are contained thirty-five stations and thirty ministers.

4. Alleghany Conference includes that part of Pennsylvania west of the Alleghany Mountains, that part of Ohio east of the Scioto river, and Western Virginia. We find included in this conference thirteen stations and circuits, and eleven ministers.

5. Miami Conference includes the State of Ohio west of the Scioto river, the States of Indiana, Illinois, and the Territories of Wisconsin and Iowa, containing twelve stations and circuits, and five ministers.

6. Michigan Conference embraces the State of Michigan, containing nine stations and fourteen ministers.

Reserve List of Preachers—Contains nine preachers.

Thus making the summary, as before stated, reckoning from the best data in our possession, of six conferences, including about three hundred ministers and preachers, who itinerate, and upwards of three hundred other ministers and preachers who are as yet unstationed; and about twenty thousand communicating members of the respective churches belonging to this division of the vineyard of our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Having thus seceded from the other branches of the Methodist Church, after much prayerful deliberation, and purely from conscientious motives, whilst our devout and fervent prayer is, that grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and his anointed Son, Jesus, our Saviour, through the effectual operations of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, may be multiplied abundantly unto all who love and long for the appearance of the great God, our Saviour: we would go forward in relying on the grace of that God which maketh rich and addeth no sorrow, in accomplishing the work which God has given us to do; whilst we would ever look to the Redeeming Saviour to work in us to will and to do of his own good pleasure. Amen.

THE MENNONITES.

BY CHRISTIAN HERR.*

THE names of Œcolampadius, Luther, Zwinglius, Melancthon, Bucer, Bullinger, Calvin, and others, whom God in his providence raised up as humble instruments to reform, to no small extent, abuses which had crept into the church, are familiar to almost every ordinary reader; while that of Menno Simon is little known, although he was cotemporary with Luther, Zwinglius, and others, and with some of whom he had personal interviews—with Luther and Melancthon, in Wittenberg; with Bullinger, at Zurich; and at Strasburg, with Bucer.

In an article necessarily brief as this must be, the question, Whether the Mennonites are descendants from the Waldenses? cannot be discussed. The testimony, however, of Dr. Ypeij, Professor of Theology at Groningen, and a member of the Dutch Reformed Church, may here be appropriately introduced, on this point. In a work written by the Professor, published at Breda, 1813, he says: "We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and have long in the history of the Church received the honour of that origin." This testimony is borne from high official authority in the Dutch Reformed Church.

The Mennonites freely acknowledge that they derived their name from Menno Simon, a native of Witmarsum, born in Friesland, A. D. 1495. He, as well as all his cotemporaries, was educated a Catholic, and in his twenty-fourth year, he undertook the duties of a priest in his father's village, called Pinningum, in Friesland; although in utter darkness of mind and worldliness of spirit, yet not without some tenderness of conscience and apparent piety. In 1530, he was in-

* This article has been prepared by the aid of the Rev. Christian Herr, of Pequoa, Lancaster county, a Bishop in the Mennonite Church, and has his approbation.—ED.

duced to examine the New Testament for himself. "I had not," says he, "proceeded far therein, before I discovered that I was deceived." His mind was completely changed; he renounced his former views, and embraced the doctrines of the New Testament, and which he zealously advocated.

He now commenced to travel, with a view to consult with some of his cotemporaries, such as Luther, Bucer, Bullinger, and others; having done so, he strenuously opposed the Munsterites. "He condemned," says Mosheim, "the plan of ecclesiastical discipline of the Munsterites, that was founded on the prospect of a new kingdom, to be miraculously established by Jesus Christ on the ruins of civil government, and the destruction of human rulers, and which had been the pestilential source of such dreadful commotions, such execrable rebellions, and such enormous crimes."*

Menno Simon plainly foresaw to what horrid extremities the pernicious doctrines of the Munsterites were calculated to lead the inconsiderate and unwary; nevertheless, as there were many pious souls who had been misled by this pernicious sect, but who had renounced all connexion and intercourse with them, and as there were also others, descendants of the ancient Waldenses, all of whom were as dispersed sheep of the house of Israel: Menno, at their earnest solicitation, assumed among them the rank and functions of a public teacher. That he was calculated to discharge the duties of his office, is evident from his success. "He had," says Mosheim, "the inestimable advantage of a natural and persuasive eloquence, and his learning was sufficient to make him pass for an oracle in the eyes of the multitude. He appears, moreover, to have been a man of probity, of a meek and tractable spirit, gentle in his manners, pliant and obsequious in his intercourse with persons of all ranks and characters, and extremely zealous in promoting practical religion and virtue, which he recommended by his example, as well as by his precepts. A man of such talents and dispositions could not fail to attract the admiration of the people, and to gain a good number of adherents wherever he exercised his ministry."†

From 1537, Menno Simon, in the capacity of a public teacher, commenced travelling from one country to another, amidst pressures and calamities of various kinds, and was constantly exposed to the imminent danger of falling a victim to the severity of the laws. He first visited East and West Friesland, the province of Groningen, thence he directed his course to Holland, Guelderland, Brabant,

* Mosheim, *Eccl. History*, vol. ii. p. 132.

† *Ibid.*

Westphalia, and continued through the German provinces that lie on the coast of the Baltic Sea, and penetrated as far as Livonia. "In all these places his ministerial labours were attended with remarkable success, and added a prodigious number of followers."* He laboured assiduously till the close of his life. He died at Fresenburg, near Oldeslohe, January 31, 1561.

His object was reformation, and the spiritual edification of his fellow-men, which he accomplished to an unparalleled extent. He purified the doctrines of the Anabaptists—some of them he reclaimed, others he excluded, who were tainted with the Munsterite heresy. He founded many communities in various parts of Europe.

From the year 1537, to the beginning of the present century, many of the Mennonites were sorely persecuted in Europe. They were compelled to flee from one country to another, and consequently have been dispersed. Some went to Russia, Prussia, Poland, Holland, Denmark, and many, on the invitation of the liberal-minded William Penn, transported themselves and families, into the province of Pennsylvania, as early as A. D. 1683. Those who came in that year and in 1698, settled in and about Germantown, where they erected a school and meeting house in 1708.

In 1709 other families from the Palatinate, descendants of the distressed and persecuted Swiss, emigrated to America, and settled in Pequea Valley, then Chester, now Lancaster county. Among these were the Herrs Meylius, Kendigs, Millers, Oberholtz, Funks, Bowmans and others. They settled in the midst of the Mingo or Conestoga, Pequea, and Shawanese Indians, where under unpropitious circumstances, they improved lands. The first who settled here were soon joined by others, who came to America in 1711, 1717, 1727, and at a later period. Before the year 1735 there were probably rising of five hundred families settled in Lancaster county. For some time they held their religious meetings, and school, in the same rude buildings. As a body, in this country, the Mennonites have spent little money in erecting stately buildings as churches, or for schools. Economy and comfort being their chief aim, they discard ornament.

Their religious views were at an early date, and since, misrepresented, and no small degree of prejudice excited against them. To allay such unfounded prejudices, they had "The Christian Confession of Faith, &c., containing the chief doctrines held by them, translated into English, and published at Philadelphia, in 1727." In the preface to that publication, they say—"that the Confession of Faith of the

* Mosheim.

harmless and defenceless Christians, called Mennonites, is as yet little known, &c.: so that the greatest portion of people doth not know what they believe and confess of the word of God, and by reason of that ignorance, cannot speak and judge rightly of their confession, nor of the confessors themselves; nay, through prejudice, as a strange and unheard of thing, do abhor them, so as not to speak well, but oftentimes ill of them. Therefore it hath been thought fit and needful to translate, at the desire of some of our fellow-believers in Pennsylvania, our Confession of Faith into English, so as for many years it hath been printed in the Dutch, German, and French languages; which confession hath been well approved of, both in the Low Countries and in France, by several eminent persons of the Reformed religion; and therefore it hath been thought worth the while to turn it also into English, that so those of that nation may become acquainted with it, and so might have a better opinion thereof, and of its professors; and not only so, but also that every well-meaning soul might inquire and try all things, and keep that which is best."

This confession, which is given below, was, at that time, (1727,) approved and received by the elders and ministers of the congregations of the people called Mennonites. "We do, (say they,) acknowledge and hereby make known, that we own the Confession. In testimony whereof, and that we believe the same to be good, we have subscribed our names:

"Shipack—Jacob Gaedtschlack, Henry Kolb, Claes Jansen, Michael Zigeler. Germantown—John Gorgas, John Conerads, Clas Rittinghausen. Conestoga—Hans Burgholtzer, Christian Heer, Benedict Hirchi, Martin Bear, Johannes Bowman. Great Swamp—Velte Clemer. Manatant—Daniel Langenecker, Jacob Beghtly."

ARTICLES OF FAITH.

The leading Articles of the Christian Faith of the Churches of the United Flemish, Friesland, and other Mennonites, and those in America, adopted A. D. 1632.

I. *Of God, of the Creation of all things and of Man.*—Since it is testified, that without faith it is impossible to please God, and that whosoever would come to God, must believe God is, and that he is a rewarder of all those who seek him; we therefore confess and believe, according to the scriptures, with all the pious, in one eternal, omnipotent, and incomprehensible God: the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and in no more or none other; before whom there was no

God, nor shall there be any after him ; for from him, by him, and in him, are all things ; to whom be praise, honour, and glory for ever and ever : Amen. (Heb. xi. 6 ; Deut. vi. 4 ; Gen. xvii. 1 ; Isa. xlv. 8 ; Job v. 7 ; Rom. xi. 36.)

We believe in this one God, who works all in all ; and confess that he is the Creator of all things, visible and invisible ; who, in six days, created heaven and earth, the sea and all that is therein ; and that he governs and upholds all his works by his wisdom, and by the word of his power. (1 Cor. xii. 6 ; Gen. i. 1-28 ; Acts xiv. 14.)

Now, as he had finished his work, and had ordained and prepared every thing good and perfect in its nature and properties, according to his good pleasure, so at last he created the first man, Adam, the father of us all ; gave him a body, formed of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, so that he became a living soul, created by God after his own image and likeness, in righteousness and true holiness, unto eternal life. He esteemed him above all creatures, and endowed him with many and great gifts ; placed him in a delightful garden, or paradise, and gave him a command and a prohibition ; afterwards he took a rib from Adam, made a woman, and brought her to Adam for a helpmate, consort, and wife. The consequence is, that from this first and only man, Adam, all men that dwell upon the earth have descended. (Gen. i. 27 ; ii. 7 ; v. 1 ; ii. 18 ; xvii. 22 ; Acts xvii. 26.)

II. *Of the Fall of Man.*—We believe and confess, according to the tenor of the scriptures, that our first parents, Adam and Eve, did not remain long in the glorious state in which they were created ; but being deceived by the subtlety of the serpent and the envy of the devil, they transgressed the high commandment of God, and disobeyed their Creator ; by which disobedience sin entered the world, and death by sin, which has thus passed upon all men, in that all have sinned, and hence incurred the wrath of God and condemnation. They were, therefore, driven of God out of paradise, to till the earth, to toil for sustenance, and to eat their bread in the sweat of their face, till they should return to the earth whence they had been taken. And that they, by this one sin, fell so far as to be separated and estranged from God, that neither they themselves, nor any of their posterity, nor angel, nor man, nor any other creature in heaven or on earth, could help them, redeem them, or reconcile them to God ; but they must have been eternally lost, had not God, in compassion for his creatures, made provision for them, interposing with love and mercy. (Gen. iii. 6 ; Rom. v. 12 ; Gen. iii. 23 ; Psalm xlix. 8, 9 ; Rev. v. 1, 5 ; John iii. 16.)

III. *Of the Restoration of Man by the promise of Christ's coming.*—Concerning the restoration of the first man and his posterity, we believe and confess, that God, notwithstanding their fall, transgression, sin, and perfect inability, was not willing to cast them off entirely, nor suffer them to be eternally lost; but that he called them again to him, comforted them, and testified that there was yet a means of reconciliation; namely, the Lamb without spot, the Son of God, who was appointed for this purpose before the foundation of the world, and was promised while they were yet in paradise, for consolation, redemption, and salvation unto them and all their posterity; nay, from that time forth was bestowed upon them by faith; afterwards all the pious forefathers, to whom this promise was frequently renewed, longed for, desired, saw by faith, and waited for the fulfilment, that at his coming he would redeem, liberate, and release fallen man from sin, guilt, and unrighteousness. (John i. 29; 1 Pet. i. 19; Gen. iii. 15; John iii. 8; ii. 1; Heb. xi. 13, 39; Gal. iv. 4.)

IV. *Of the Coming of Christ, and the Cause of his Coming.*—We further believe and confess, that when the time of his promise, which all the forefathers anxiously expected, was fulfilled, the promised Messiah, Redeemer, and Saviour, proceeded from God, was sent, and according to the predictions of the prophets, and the testimony of the evangelists, came into the world, nay, was made manifest in the flesh, and thus the Word was made flesh and man; that he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, who was espoused to Joseph, of the House of David; and that she brought forth her first-born Son at Bethlehem, wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger. (John iv. 25; xvi. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 15; John i. 14; Matt. i. 22; Luke ii. 7.)

We confess and believe, that this is he whose going forth is from everlasting to everlasting, without beginning of days, or end of life; of whom it is testified that he is Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last; that he is the same, and no other, who was provided, promised, sent and came into the world, and who is God's first and only Son, and who was before John the Baptist, Abraham, and prior to the formation of the world; nay, who was the Lord of David, and the God of the universe, the first born of all creatures, who was sent into the world, and yielded up the body which was prepared for him, a sacrifice and offering, for a sweet savour to God; nay, for the consolation, redemption, and salvation of the whole world. (Micah v. 1; Heb. vii. 3; Rev. i. 8, 18; John

iii. 16; Heb. i. 6; Rom. viii. 32; John i. 30; Matt. xx. 11, 41; Col. i. 15.)

But as to how and in what manner this worthy body was prepared, and how the Word became flesh, we are satisfied with the statement given by the evangelists; agreeably to which, we confess, with all the saints, that he is the Son of the living God, in whom alone consist all our hope, consolation, redemption, and salvation. (Luke i. 30, 31; John xx. 30, 31; Matt. xvi. 16.)

We further believe and confess with the scriptures, that when he had fulfilled his course, and finished the work for which he had been sent into the world, he was, according to the providence of God, delivered into the hands of wicked men; that he suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried; rose again from the dead on the third day; ascended to heaven, and sits on the right hand of the majesty of God on high; whence he will come again to judge the living and the dead. (Luke xxii. 53; xxiii. 1; xxiv. 5, 6, 51.)

And also that the Son of God died, tasted death, and shed his precious blood, for all men; and that thereby he bruised the serpent's head, destroyed the works of the devil, abolished the handwriting, and obtained the remission of sins for the whole human family; that he became the means (author) of eternal salvation to all those who, from Adam to the end of the world, believe in and obey him. (Gen. iii. 15; John iii. 8; Col. ii. 14; Rom. v. 18.)

V. *Of the Law of Christ—the Gospel or the New Testament.*—We believe and confess, that previous to his ascension, he made, instituted, and left his *New Testament*, and gave it to his disciples, that it should remain an everlasting testament, which he confirmed and sealed with his blood, and commended it so highly to them, that it is not to be altered, neither by angels nor men, neither to be added thereto, nor taken therefrom. And that, inasmuch as it contains the whole will and counsel of his heavenly Father, as far as is necessary for salvation, he has caused it to be promulgated by his apostles, missionaries, and ministers, whom he called and chose for that purpose, and sent into all the world, to preach in his name among all people, and nations and tongues, testifying repentance and the forgiveness of sins; and that consequently he has therein declared all men, without exception, as his children and lawful heirs, so far as they follow and live up to the contents of the same by faith, as obedient children; and thus, he has not excluded any from the glorious inheritance of everlasting life, except the unbelieving, the disobedient, the obstinate, and the perverse, who despise it, and, by their continual sinning, render

themselves unworthy of eternal life. (Jer. xxxi. 18; Heb. ix. 15; xvi. 17; Matt. xxvi. 27; Gal. i. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 3; John xv. 15; Matt. xviii. 19; Mark xvi. 13; Luke xxiv. 4, 5; Rom. viii. 17; Acts xiii. 46.)

VI. *Of Repentance and Reformation.*—We believe and confess, since the thoughts of the heart are evil from youth, and prone to unrighteousness, sin, and wickedness, that the first lesson of the New Testament of the Son of God, is repentance and reformation. Men, therefore, who have ears to hear and hearts to understand, must bring forth fruits meet for repentance, reform their lives, believe the gospel, eschew evil and do good, desist from sin and forsake unrighteousness, put off the old man with all his works, and put on the new man, created after God in righteousness and true holiness; for neither baptism, supper, church, nor any other outward ceremony, can, without faith, regeneration, change or reformation of life, enable us to please God, or obtain from him any consolation, or promise of salvation. But we must go to God with sincere hearts and true and perfect faith, and believe on Jesus Christ, according to the testimony of the scriptures; by this living faith we obtain remission or forgiveness of sins, are justified, sanctified, nay, made children of God, partakers of his image, nature, and mind: being born again of God from above, through the incorruptible seed. (Gen. viii. 21; Mark i. 15; Ezekiel xii. 1; 1 Col. iii. 9, 10; Eph. iv. 21, 22; Heb. x. 21, 22; John vii. 38.)

VII. *Of Baptism.*—As regards baptism, we confess that all penitent believers, who, by faith, regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, are made one with God and written in heaven, must upon their scriptural confession of faith, and reformation of life, be baptized with water,* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, agreeably to the doctrine and command of Christ; and the usage of his apostles, to the burying of their sins; and thus be received into fellowship with the saints; whereupon they must learn to observe all things which the Son of God taught, left to, and commanded his disciples. (Matt. xviii. 19, 20; Rom. vi. 4; Mark xvi. 15; Matt. iii. 15; Acts ii. 28; viii. 11; ix. 18; x. 47; xvi. 33; Col. ii. 11, 12.)

VIII. *Of the Church of Christ.*—We believe and confess there is a visible Church of God; namely, those who, as aforementioned, do works meet for repentance, have true faith, and received a true bap-

* The Mennonites baptize by pouring water upon the head of the person baptized.—

tism, are made one with God in heaven, and received into fellowship of the saints here upon earth: those we profess are the chosen generation, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, who have the witness that they are the spouse and bride of Christ; nay, the children and heirs of everlasting life; a habitation, a tabernacle, a dwelling-place of God in the spirit, built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets, Christ being the chief corner-stone (upon which his church is built)—*this church of the living God*, which he bought, purchased, and redeemed with his own precious blood, with which *church*, according to his promise, he will always remain to the end of the world, as protector and comforter of *believers*, nay, will dwell with them, walk among them, and so protect them, that neither floods nor tempests, nor the gates of hell shall prevail against or overthrow them. This church is to be distinguished by scriptural faith, doctrine, love, godly walk or deportment, as also by a profitable or fruitful conversation, use and observance of the true ordinances of Christ, which he strictly enjoined upon his followers. (1 Cor. xii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 9; John iii. 29; Rev. xix. 7; Tit. iii. 6, 7; Eph. ii. 19, 20, 21; Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Matt. vii. 35.)

IX. *Of the Election and Office of Teachers, Deacons, and Deaconesses in the Church.*—As regards offices and elections in the church, we believe and confess, since the church cannot subsist in her growth, nor remain an edifice without officers and discipline, that, therefore, the Lord Jesus Christ himself instituted and ordained offices and ordinances, and gave commands and directions, how every one ought to walk therein, take heed to his work and vocation, and do that which is right and necessary; for he, as the true, great and chief Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, was sent and came into the world, not to wound or destroy the souls of men, but to heal and restore them; to seek the lost; to break down the middle wall of partition; of two to make one; to gather together her out of Jews, Gentiles, and all nations, a fold to have fellowship in his name; for which, in order that none might err or go astray, he laid down his own life, and thus made a way for their salvation, redeeming and releasing them, when there was no one to help or assist. (1 Pet. ii. 29; Matt. xii. 19; xviii. 11; Eph. ii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; John x. 9; xi. 15; Ps. xlix. 8.)

And further, that he provided his church, before his departure, with faithful ministers, evangelists, pastors and teachers, whom he had chosen by the Holy Ghost, with prayers and supplications, in order that they might govern the church, feed his flock, watch over them, defend, and provide for them; nay, do in all things as he did, going

before them, as he taught, acted and commanded ; teaching them to do all things whatsoever he commanded them. (Eph. iv. 11 ; Luke x. 1 ; vi. 12, 13 ; John ii. 15 ; Matt. xxviii. 20.)

That the apostles, likewise, as true followers of Christ, and leaders of the church, were diligent with prayers and supplication to God, in electing brethren, providing every city, place or church, with bishops, pastors and leaders, and ordaining such persons as took heed to themselves, and to the doctrine and flock ; who were sound in the faith, virtuous in life and conversation, and were of good report, both in and out of the church, in order that they might be an example, light, and pattern, in all godliness, with good works, worthily administering the Lord's ordinances, baptism and supper, and that they might appoint in all places, faithful men as elders, capable of teaching others, ordaining them by the imposition of hands, in the name of the Lord ; further, to have the care, according to their ability, for all things necessary in the church ; so that as faithful servants, they might husband well their Lord's talent, gain by it, and consequently save themselves and those who hear them. (1 Tim. iii. ; Acts i. 23, 24 ; Tit. i. 5 ; 1 Tim. iv. 14, 16 ; Tit. ii. 1, 2 ; 2 Tim. ii. 2 ; 1 Tim. v. 2.)

That they should also have a care for every one, of whom they have the oversight ; to provide in all places deacons, who may receive contributions and alms, in order faithfully to dispense them to the necessitous saints, with all becoming honesty and decorum. (Luke xix. 13. Of deacons, Acts v. 3-6 ; of deaconesses, 1 Tim. v. 9 ; Rom. xvi. 1 ; James i. 27.)

That honourable and aged widows should be chosen deaconesses, who, with the deacons, may visit, comfort, and provide for poor, weak, infirm, distressed and indigent persons, as also to visit widows and orphans ; and further, assist in taking care of the concerns of the church, according to their ability.

And further respecting deacons, that they, particularly when they are capable, being elected and ordained thereto by the church, for the relief and assistance of the elders, may admonish the members of the church, being appointed thereto, and labour in word and doctrine, assisting one another out of love with the gift received of the Lord ; by which means, through the mutual service and assistance of every member, according to his measure, the body of Christ may be edified, and the vine and church of the Lord may grow up, increase, and be preserved.

X. *Of the Holy Supper.*—We likewise confess and observe a breaking of bread, or supper, which the Lord Jesus Christ instituted with

bread and wine before his passion, did eat it with his apostles, and commanded it to be kept in remembrance of himself; which they consequently taught and observed in the church, and commanded to be kept by believers, in remembrance of the sufferings and death of the Lord, and that his body was broken, and his precious blood was shed for us, and for the whole human family; as also the fruits thereof, namely, redemption and everlasting salvation, which he procured thereby, exhibiting so great love towards sinners, by which we are greatly admonished to love one another, to love our neighbour, forgiving him, as he has done unto us, and we are to strive to preserve the unity and fellowship which we have with God and with one another, which is also represented to us, in the breaking of bread. (Acts ii. 46.)

XI. *Of Washing the Saints' Feet.*—We also confess the washing of the saints' feet, which the Lord not only instituted and commanded, but he actually washed his apostles' feet, although he was their Lord and Master, and gave them an example that they should wash one another's feet, and do as he had done unto them: they, as a matter of course, taught the believers to observe this as a sign of true humility, and particularly as directing the mind by *feet-washing*, to that right washing, by which we are washed in his blood, and have our souls made pure. (John xiii. 4–17; 1 Tim. v. 10; Gen. xvii. 4; xix. 2; xxiv. 32; xliii. 24.)

XII. *Of Matrimony or State of Marriage.*—We confess that there is in the church, an honourable marriage between two believers, as God ordained it in the beginning in paradise, and instituted it between Adam and Eve; as also the Lord Jesus Christ opposed and did away the abuses of marriage, which had crept in, and restored it to its primitive institution. (Gen. i. 27; Matt. xi. 4.)

In this manner, the Apostle Paul also taught *marriage* in the Church; and left it free for every one, according to its primitive institution, to be married in the Lord, to any one who may consent; by the phrase, *in the Lord*, we think it ought to be understood, that as the patriarchs had to marry among their own kindred or relatives, so likewise the believers of the New Testament are not at liberty to marry, except among the chosen generation and the spiritual kindred or relatives of Christ; namely, such and no others, as have been united to the church, as one heart and soul, having received baptism and stand in the same communion, faith, doctrine and conversation, before they become united in marriage. Such are then joined together according to the original ordinance of God in his church, and this is

called *marrying in the Lord*. (1 Cor. v. 11; ix. 5; Gen. xxiv.; xxviii.; 1 Cor. vii. 39.)

XIII. *Of the Magistracy*.—We believe and confess, that God instituted and appointed authority and a magistracy for the punishing of the evil-doers, and to protect the good; as also to govern the world, and preserve the good order of cities and countries; hence, we dare not despise, gainsay or resist the same; but we must acknowledge the magistracy as the minister of God, be subject and obedient thereunto in all good works, especially in all things not repugnant to God's law, will and commandment; also faithfully pay tribute and tax, and render that which is due, even as the Son of God taught and practised, and commanded his disciples to do; that it is our duty, constantly and earnestly to pray to the Lord for the government, its prosperity, and the welfare of the country, that we may live under its protection, gain a livelihood, and lead a quiet, peaceable life, in all godliness and sobriety. And further, that the Lord may reward them in time and eternity, for all the favours, benefits, and the liberty we here enjoy under their praiseworthy administration. (Rom. xiii. 1-7; Tit. iii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 17; Matt. xxii. 21; 1 Tim. ii. 1.)

XIV. *Of Defence or Revenge*.—As regards revenge, or defence, in which men resist their enemies with the sword: we believe and confess, that the Lord Jesus Christ forbade his disciples his followers, all revenge and defence, and commanded them, besides, not to render evil for evil, nor railing for railing, but to sheathe their swords, or in the words of the prophet, "to beat them into ploughshares." (Matt. v. 39-44; Rom. xii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 9; Isa. ii. 4; Mic. iv. 3; Zech. ix. 8, 9.)

Hence it is evident, according to his example and doctrine, that we should not provoke or do violence to any man, but we are to seek to promote the welfare and happiness of all men; even, when necessary, to flee, for the Lord's sake, from one country to another, and take patiently the spoiling of our goods; but to do violence to no man: when we are smitten on one cheek to turn the other, rather than take revenge or resent evil. And, moreover, that we must pray for our enemies, feed and refresh them when they are hungry or thirsty, and thus convince them by kindness, and overcome all ignorance. (Rom. xii. 19, 20.) Finally, that we should do good, and approve ourselves to the consciences of all men; and according to the law of Christ, do unto others as we would wish them to do unto us. (2 Cor. iv. 2; Matt. vii. 12; xii. 7.)

XV. *Of Oaths or Swearing*.—Respecting judicial oaths, we believe and confess, that Christ our Lord did forbid his disciples the use of

them, and commanded them that they should not swear at all; but that yea should be yea; and nay, nay. Hence we infer, that all oaths, greater and minor, are prohibited; and that we must, instead of oaths, confirm all our promises and assertions, nay, all our declarations or testimonies, in every case, with the word *yea* in that which is yea; and with *nay* in that which is nay; hence we should always and in all cases perform, keep, follow, and live up to our word or engagement as fully as if we had confirmed and established it by an oath. And we do this; we have the confidence that no man, not even the magistrate, will have just reason to lay a more grievous burden on our mind and conscience. (Matt. v. 34, 35; James v. 12; 2 Cor. i. 17.)

XVI. *Of Ecclesiastical Excommunication or Separation from the Church.*—We also believe and profess a ban, excommunication, or separation, and Christian correction in the church, for amendment, and not for destruction, whereby the clean or pure may be separated from the unclean or defiled. Namely, if any one, after having been enlightened, and has attained to the knowledge of the truth, and has been received into the fellowship of the saints, sins either voluntarily or presumptuously against God, or unto death; and falls into the unfruitful works of darkness, by which he separates himself from God, and is debarred his kingdom; such a person, we believe, when the deed is manifest and the church has sufficient evidence, ought not to remain in the congregation of the righteous; but shall and must be separated as an offending member and an open sinner; be excommunicated and reprov'd in the presence of all, and purged out as leaven; and this to be done for his own amendment, and an example and terror to others, that the church be kept pure from such foul spots; lest, in default of this, the name of the Lord be blasphemed, the church dishonoured; and a stumbling-block and cause of offence be given to them that are without; in fine, that the sinner may not be damned with the world, but become convicted, repent and reform. (Isa. lix. 2; 1 Cor. v. 5, 12; 1 Tim. v. 20; 2 Cor. x. 8; xiii. 10; James v. 8, 9.)

Further, regarding brotherly reproof or admonition, as also the instruction of those who err, it is necessary to use all care and diligence to observe them, instructing them with all meekness to their own amendment, and reprov'g the obstinate according as the case may require. In short, that the church must excommunicate him that sins either in doctrine or life, and no other. (Tit. iii. 10; 1 Cor. v. 12.)

XVII. *Of Shunning or Avoiding the Separated or Excommunicated.*—Touching the avoiding of the separated, we believe and confess,

that if any one has so far fallen off, either by a wicked life or perverted doctrine, that he is separated from God, and consequently is justly separated from and corrected or punished by the church, such a person must be shunned, according to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, and avoided without partiality by all the members of the church, especially by those to whom it is known, whether in eating or drinking, or other similar temporal matters; and they shall have no dealings with him: to the end that they may not be contaminated by intercourse with him, nor made partakers of his sins; but that the sinner may be made ashamed, be convicted, and again led to repentance. (1 Cor. v. 9, 10, 11; 2 Thess. iii. 14; Tit. iii. 10.)

That there be used, as well in the avoidance as in the separation, such moderation and Christian charity as may have a tendency, not to promote his destruction, but to insure his reformation. For if he is poor, hungry, thirsty, naked, sick, or in distress, we are in duty bound, according to necessity, and agreeably to love and to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, to render him aid and assistance; otherwise, in such cases, the avoidance might tend more to his ruin than to his reformation. (2 Thess. v. 14.)

Hence we must not consider excommunicated members as enemies, but admonish them as brethren, in order to bring them to knowledge, repentance, and sorrow for their sins, that they may be reconciled with God and his church; and, of course, be received again into the church, and so may continue in love towards him, as his case demands.

XVIII. *Of the Resurrection of the Dead, and the last Judgment.*—Relative to the Resurrection of the Dead, we believe and confess, agreeably to the scriptures, that all men who have died and fallen asleep, shall be awakened, quickened, and raised on the last day, by the incomprehensible power of God; and that these, together with those that are then alive, and who shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye, at the sound of the last trumpet, shall be placed before the judgment seat of Christ, and the good be separated from the wicked; that then every one shall receive in his own body according to his works, whether they be good or evil; and that the good and pious shall be taken up with Christ, as the blessed, enter into everlasting life, and obtain that joy, which no eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor mind conceived, to reign and triumph with Christ from everlasting to everlasting. (Matt. xxii. 30, 31; Dan. xii. 12; Job xix. 26, 27; John v. 28; 2 Cor. v. 10; 1 Cor. xv.; Rev. xxi. 11; 1 Thess. iv. 13.)

And that, on the contrary, the wicked or impious shall be driven away as accursed, and thrust down into utter darkness; nay, into

everlasting pains of hell, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched; and that they shall never have any prospect of hope, comfort, or redemption. (Mark ix. 44.)

May the Lord grant that none of us may meet the fate of the wicked; but that we may take heed and be diligent, so that we may be found before him in peace, without spot, and blameless. Amen.

Done and finished in our United Churches, in the city of Dortrecht, 21st April, A. D., 1632; subscribed:

Dortrecht—Isaac de Koning, John Jacobs, Hans Corbryssen, Jaques Terwen, Nicholas Dirkson, Mels Gylberts, Adriaan Cornelison. Zeeland—Cornelius de Moir, Isaac Claasz. Middleburg—Bastian Willemsen, John Winkelmans. Vlissingen—Oillaert Willeborts, Jacob Pennen, Lieven Marynesz. Zierich—Anthony Cornellison, Peter Jansen Zimmerman. Gorcum—Jacob Van der Heyde Sebrechts, Hans Jansen van de Kruysen. Arnhem—Cornelius Jahnsen, Dirk Ronderson. Rotterdam—Balten Centen Schoomaker, Michel Michelsson, Israel van Halmael, Henry Jahnsen Appeldoorn, Andries Lucken, jr. Amsterdam—Tobias Govertson, Peter Jahnsen Moyer, Abraham Dirkson, David ter Haer, Peter Jahnsen van Singel. Leyden—Christian de Koning, Johannes Weyns. Harlem—Johannes Doom, Peter Gryspeer, Dirk Wouters Kolenkamp, Peter Joosten. Schiedam—Cornelius Bom, Lambert Paeldink. Blokziel—Claes Claesen, Peter Petersen, Dirk Rendersen. Utrecht—Hermann Segerts, John Hendricksen Hooghvelt, Daniel Horens, Abraham Spronk, William von Brockhuysen. Bommel—Wilhelm Jansen van Exselt, Gyspert Spiering. Germany—Peter van Borsel, Anthony Hans. Krevelt—Herman op de Graff, Wilhelm Kreynen.

The foregoing articles are received and maintained by all the Mennonites throughout the United States, Territories, and in Canada, wherever they have been dispersed; for, since the first immigration of the Mennonites to this country, they have been spread over a great portion of Pennsylvania, where large bodies of them are found in Lancaster county, in Bucks, Chester, Philadelphia, Montgomery, Dauphin, Cumberland, Juniata, Mifflin, Franklin, York, Westmoreland, and some other counties, and also in Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, New York, and in Canada.

The Mennonite congregations in Pennsylvania are divided into three general circuits, within each of which, semi-annual conferences, consisting of bishops, elders or ministers, and deacons, are held for the purpose of consulting each other, and devising means to advance the spiritual prosperity of the members. A similar confer-

ence is held in Ohio, where the Mennonites are very numerous, consisting, however, principally of foreign immigrants who have settled there within the last thirty years. The members of the congregations in Indiana are principally from Switzerland. In Canada they have from fifteen to twenty places where religious meetings are held; their semi-annual conferences are alternately held at Waterloo, Clinton, and Markham.

Bishops, elders or ministers, and deacons, are usually chosen by casting lots. Their pastors neither receive nor accept stipulated salaries, nor any kind of remuneration for preaching the gospel, or in attending to the functions of their office. Their number of ministers, members, congregations, and houses of public worship, in America, has been variously estimated; but the exact number of members cannot be given,* as they keep no records among them for that purpose. In this they hold the same views as they do in giving alms, when our Saviour says (Matt. vi.): "Take heed that ye do not your alms," &c. So they believe it would not be acceptable in the sight of God to make a public display of the number of their communicants, as they know the Head of the Church of God, namely, Jesus Christ, sees and knows who are his children in the whole world. Furthermore, they bear in mind the confession of King David, declaring himself that he greatly sinned by causing Israel to be numbered. (2 Sam. xxiv.)

* In a letter to the editor from Shem Zook, who is well-informed in the religious statistics of the Mennonites, he says, when speaking of the Mennonites, "their number in the United States has been computed at 120,000." This estimate, we think, is too high. So far as we can ascertain, they have about ninety-five ministers in Pennsylvania, one hundred and eighty places of public worship; in Virginia, from thirty to forty ministers, about thirty-five places of worship. In Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, and New York, probably eighty-five ministers, and one hundred and thirty places of worship. In all America, about two hundred and thirty or forty ministers, and rising of four hundred places of public worship, and between fifty and sixty thousand members. The whole Mennonite population may probably exceed 120,000; but they have not that number of communicating members.

They are distinguished above all others for their plainness in dress, economy in their domestic arrangements; being frugal, thrifty, and withal very hospitable. They take in strangers; treat them kindly without charge. They suffer none of their members to become a public charge.—Ed.

REFORMED MENNONITE SOCIETY.*

BY THE REV. JOHN HERR,
STRASBURG, LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.

HISTORY.

THE Mennonite denomination derived its name from Menno Simon, a very zealous and successful reformer; but, owing to the manner in which he and his followers were persecuted, and his doctrines and views misrepresented, through the malice of his papistical adversaries, his name was never handed down to posterity, side by side with that of Luther, Calvin, and others; though it must be admitted, he did as much towards the enlightening of mankind, and contended with adversaries as powerful, as ever impeded the progress of Luther, and all those illustrious personages, whose names shed such a lustre on the history of the Reformation.

But as there is required a history of the Reformed branch of the Mennonite Society only, it will not fall within the design of this sketch, to trace her history to that dark and superstitious period, when the earth was daily drenched with the blood of the righteous.

How long the followers of Menno, adhered to the doctrines he had inculcated—how long they practised his precepts, and guarded with a jealous eye those divine truths, that he had promulgated, is not exactly known; but we are informed from a source which cannot be doubted, that soon after the persecution ceased, there was a gradual falling off from their former purity, and that they did not carry into effect the doctrines they had formerly taught and professed. From this it is evident, that they became, by degrees, more and more corrupted.

* This article has the sanction of the Rev. John Herr, of Strasburg, a Bishop of this Society.—ED.

It was when viewing their fallen state, and on reflecting how they had deviated from the path in which they had formerly trod; how they resisted minor evils, though they were instructed that the New Testament showed expressly, that Christ taught his disciples to resist no evil whatever; in short, it was when contrasting their conditions now, with what they professed then, that a few individuals contemplated the design of restoring them to their former purity. They, for this purpose, met repeatedly, and exchanged in simplicity of heart the sentiments of their minds. They warned the Mennonites of their delusion; but as they were unwilling to be convinced of the errors under which they were labouring, and as those few enlightened souls found it impossible to take part in their proceedings, as long as they remained in their defiled condition, they found it necessary to renovate and renew the whole Mennonite doctrine. They accordingly razed the rubbish to the foundation, on which they commenced building the church of Christ anew. This happened in the year 1811; and as their number was continually on the increase, they found it necessary, after much prayer, supplication, and submission to the will of God, to appoint one, from amongst their number, to superintend this desirable work. But as they were all aware that the undertaking was of no ordinary kind; and each one being impressed with the conviction that he was too feeble to take the lead in exposing the evils that arise from holding the laws of God at defiance, and from bringing perverted and sinful souls from darkness unto light, they, as may be readily supposed, felt considerable diffidence about making a choice. It was, for a long time, their general theme for discussion at their private meetings; but, on finding that it was unnecessary to delay it any longer, and being convinced of the necessity of appointing one to fill the ministerial station, they made a choice, which devolved upon John Herr. It was a grievous task—as he himself expresses it—but, owing to the conviction that he had been called by the Almighty to exert himself to the utmost to re-establish the fallen state of the church; and to the powerful appeals and pressing solicitations of his fellow-labourers, he found himself unable to refuse.

And now that they were fairly in the field, they invited the public, and commenced operations with redoubled vigour; and though public opinion has pointed the finger of scorn at their perseverance and exertions; and though their doctrines were despised by the ignorant multitude, and the difficulties they had to surmount not a few, they nevertheless removed every obstacle that was intended to impede their progress, fearless and undismayed; and notwithstanding the

predictions to the contrary, by certain individuals, success has crowned their efforts.

Before concluding the first part of this sketch, it will not be amiss, perhaps, to give the reader a passage from the *Illustrating Mirror*, page 393, written by John Herr.

Speaking about his entering on his ministerial duties, he says: "At last I consented to put my talent to usury, according as God imparted to me the measure of faith, by the influence of his Spirit; to him alone be the praise, who has at all times comforted and supported me in all my infirmities under which I have frequently groaned. Yes, from the depth of my soul I thank the everlasting God, through Jesus Christ, who granted me blessing, power and success in speaking his words without timidity, and made it fruitful in the hearts of many, who, by the hearing of the word, have been brought to believe; yea, have been turned, through Jesus, from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. So I began to labour at this holy city and temple, not only with the word of repentance and faith, but also with the holy baptism, supper, foot-washing and all the apostolical ordinances, and to join the fallen and scattered stones together again for a spiritual body and temple of the Lord. Moreover, the Lord of mercy rendered me assistance, by the word of his power, in bringing the rough and unshapen stones from the mountain of sublimity and carnal reason; which stones, through the hidden power of the Holy Spirit, were, and daily are, changed or dressed, and made brilliant by the rays of eternal light; to the eternal and only wise God, the Father of mercies and all good, be alone the honour and the praise, through Jesus Christ, for ever and ever, Amen."

DOCTRINE.

Regarding the doctrinal points, it becomes necessary to state that the articles of their Confession of Faith have been modified and condensed, as much as is allowable, without destroying the sense, in order to make it as brief and perspicuous as possible.

A representation of the chief Articles of their Christian Faith, as taught and practised in their Church.

1. They believe, and confess, according to scripture, in one Eternal, Almighty, and Incomprehensible God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and no more, and no other; who works all in all, and is the

Creator of all things visible and invisible ; and that he created our first parents after his own image and likeness, in righteousness and true holiness, unto eternal life ; and that he endowed them with many and great gifts, and placed them in paradise, and gave them a command and prohibition.

2. They believe and confess, that our first parents were created with a free will, susceptible of change ; and that they were at liberty to fear, serve, and obey their Creator, or disobey and forsake him ; and that, through the subtlety of the serpent, and the envy of the devil, they transgressed the command of God, and disobeyed their Creator ; by which disobedience sin and death came into the world, and thus passed upon all men. They also believe that, by this one sin, they were driven from paradise, became so far fallen, separated, and estranged from God, that neither they nor their posterity, nor any other creature in heaven or on earth, could redeem or reconcile them to God ; and that they would have been eternally lost, had not God interposed with his love and mercy.

3. They believe and confess, that God, notwithstanding their fall and transgression, did not wish to cast them away, and have them eternally lost ; but that he called them again to him, comforted them, and testified that there was yet a means of reconciliation ; namely, that the Son of God, who was appointed unto this purpose before the foundation of the world, and who was promised unto them and their posterity, for their reconciliation and redemption, while yet in paradise, from that time forth was bestowed upon them by faith.

4. They believe and confess, that when the time of the promise was fulfilled, this promised Messiah proceeded from God, was sent, and came into the world, and thus the Word was made flesh and man ; they also believe, that his going forth is from everlasting to everlasting, without beginning of days, or end of life ; that he is the beginning and the end, the first and the last ; and, also, that he was God's first and only Son, and who was the Lord of David, and the God of the world.

They further believe, that when he had fulfilled his course, he was delivered into the hands of the wicked ; was crucified, dead, and buried ; rose again on the third day, ascended to heaven, and sits on the right hand of the majesty of God ; from whence he will come again to judge the quick and the dead. And that through his death, and the shedding of his blood for all men, he bruised the serpent's head, destroyed the works of the devil, and obtained the forgiveness of sins for the whole human family.

5. They believe and confess, that previously to his ascension he

instituted and left his New Testament, which he confirmed and sealed with his blood, and commended it so highly to his disciples, that it is not to be altered, nor added to, nor diminished. And that, inasmuch as it contains the whole will of his heavenly Father, he has caused it to be promulgated over the earth, and appointed apostles, missionaries, and ministers, to teach it in his name to all people, nations, and tongues; and has therein declared all men his children and lawful heirs, provided they live up to the same by faith.

6. They believe and confess, that the first lesson of the New Testament of the Son of God is repentance and reformation; hence it is their opinion, that men must reform their lives, believe in the gospel, desist from sin, forsake unrighteousness, sacrifice the old man with all his works, and put on the new man created after God in unsullied holiness.

7. As regards baptism, they confess, that all penitent believers, who by faith, regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, are made one with God must, upon their scriptural confession of faith, and reformation of life, be baptized with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, agreeably to the doctrine and commandment of Christ; whereupon they must learn to observe all which the Son of God taught and commanded his disciples.

8. They believe and confess a visible Church of God; namely, those that are made one with God in heaven, and received into the fellowship of the saints here on earth. They also confess, that the same are the chosen people, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, and the children and heirs of everlasting life, a dwelling-place of God in the spirit, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ being the chief corner-stone, upon which the church is built; and this church must be known, by her obedience to her supreme Head and King; in all matters of faith to obey him, and to keep all his commandments; and as a virgin and bride forsakes father, mother, and all strange company, and yields herself to the will of her bridegroom, so all the true children of God, must separate from all false worship, flee from the voice of strangers, and give ear unto no one, except Christ and his commissioned ministers.

9. With regard to the offices and elections of the church, they believe and confess, that the Lord Jesus Christ himself instituted and ordained offices, and ordinances, and gave directions how every one should do that which is right and necessary; and further, that he provided his church, before his departure, with ministers, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, in order that they might govern the church, watch over his flock, and defend and provide for it; and that the apostles likewise elected brethren, and provided every city, place, or

church, with bishops, pastors and leaders ; and that they always had to be sound in faith, virtuous in life and conversation, and of good report both in and out of church, in order that they might be an example in all good and virtuous deeds.

10. They also confess, and observe a breaking of bread or supper, which Christ instituted with bread and wine before his suffering, eat it with his apostles, and commanded it to be kept in remembrance of himself, which they consequently taught and practised in the church, and commanded to be kept by all true believers in remembrance of the sufferings and death of the Lord ; and that his body was broken, and his precious blood shed for the benefit of the whole human race ; the fruits of which are redemption and everlasting salvation, which he procured thereby, manifesting such great love towards sinners, by which all true believers are greatly admonished to love one another, even as he has loved them ; and as many grains are united together into one bread, and many grapes into one cup of wine : so shall they as many members be united into one body, and all partakers of the same bread ; and without this union of spirit, and true holiness, no one can be admitted to this holy supper.

11. They also confess the washing of the saints' feet, because the Lord not only commanded it, but actually washed the feet of his disciples, although he was their Lord and Master ; and by so doing, he gave them an example, which they were necessitated to follow. Besides, they believe it their duty to consider with profound meditation, how the blessed Son of God humbled himself, not only in washing his disciples' feet, but much rather, because he washed and purified our souls, with his precious blood, from all the pollution of eternal damnation.

12. With regard to marriage, they believe there is in the church an honourable marriage, between two believers, as God ordained in the beginning in paradise, and instituted it between Adam and Eve ; as also Christ opposed and reformed the abuses that had taken place, and restored it to its original condition. They further believe, that as the patriarchs had to marry among their own kindred, so likewise, the followers of Christ are not at liberty to marry, except such, and no others, as have been united with the church as one heart, and one soul, and stand in the same communion, faith, and doctrine.

13. They confess and believe, that God instituted and appointed authority and the magistracy as a punishment for evil-doers, and a protection for the good ; hence they dare not gainsay or resist it ; but must acknowledge the magistracy as the minister of God, be subject and obedient in all things, not repugnant to God's law and com-

mandments; also faithfully pay tribute and tax, and render that which is due, as Christ taught, practised, and commanded his disciples to do; and also, that it is their duty to pray constantly for the prosperity of the government and welfare of the country. They further believe that, as Christ avoided the grandeur of this world, and conducted himself as an humble minister, none of his followers must discharge the duties of a magisterial office, or any branch of it, following, in this, the example of Christ and his apostles, under whose church these specified offices were not administered; and as they are instructed not to hold any worldly office whatever, they likewise think themselves deprived of the liberty of elevating others to a magisterial, or any other office.

14. Concerning the spiritual kingdom of Christ, they confess and believe, that it is not of this world; and that he dissuaded all his ministers and followers from all worldly power, forbidding the same, and instituted a diversity of offices in his church, whereby the saints may be joined together, so as to build up the body of Christ; and that they must not be equipped with carnal weapons; but, on the contrary, with the armour of God, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, in order that they may be enabled to fight against, and overcome flesh and blood—the allurements of the world and sin—and thus, finally to overcome and receive, through grace, the crown of everlasting life, from this our Eternal King, as their recompense and reward.

15. As regards revenge, they believe and confess, that Christ did forbid his disciples all revenge and defence, and commanded them not to render evil for evil; hence they consider it evident, according to his example and doctrine, that they should not provoke, or do violence to any man, or enter into any legal process, but seek to promote the welfare and happiness of all men; and that they should pray for their enemies, feed and refresh them when hungry or thirsty, and thus convince them by kindness, and overcome all ignorance by doing unto others, as they would that others should do unto them.

16. Respecting oaths, they believe and confess, that Christ did forbid his disciples the use of them, and commanded that they should not swear at all. Hence they infer, that all oaths, greater or minor, are prohibited; and that they must, instead of this, confirm all their declarations, assertions, and testimonies with the word yea in that which is yea, and nay in that which is nay. Hence they should always perform, follow, keep and live up to their words, as though they had confirmed them with an oath.

17. They also believe and confess a ban, separation, and Christian

correction in the church, whereby the pure may be distinguished from the defiled. Namely, if any one, who has embraced religion, and attained the knowledge of truth, sins either voluntarily or presumptuously against God or unto death: they believe that such a person, when the church has sufficient evidence of the case, cannot remain in the congregation of the righteous; but shall and must be separated, excommunicated and reprov'd in the presence of all, and considered as an offending member and open sinner; in order that he may be an example and terror to others, and that the church may remain pure and undefiled. And concerning brotherly reproofs and admonition, they consider it necessary to instruct them with all meekness to their own amendment, and reprove the obstinate, according as the case may require.

18. Respecting the avoiding of the separated, they believe and confess, that if any one, by a wicked life, or perverted doctrine, has separated himself from God, and consequently from the church, he must be shamed, according to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, and avoided without partiality, by all members of the church unto whom it is known, whether in eating, drinking, or other similar matters; and that they should have no dealings with him; for the purpose of making the sinner ashamed, be convicted, and called to repentance.

It is also their belief, that there should be used in the avoiding, as well as in the separation, such moderation and Christian charity, as may have a tendency to insure his reformation; hence they do not consider them as enemies, but admonish them as brethren, in order to bring them to knowledge, and be reconciled to God and his church.

19. Relative to the resurrection of the dead, they believe and confess, agreeably to scripture, that all men that have died, shall be awakened, quickened, and raised on the last day, by the incomprehensible power of God; and that these, together with those that are then alive, who shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye at the sound of the last trumpet, shall be placed before the judgment seat of Christ; and that the good will be separated from the wicked: that then every one shall receive in his own body, according to his works, whether they be good or evil; and that the good or pious shall be taken up with Christ, as the blessed, enter into everlasting life, and obtain that joy, which no eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor mind conceived, to reign with Christ from everlasting to everlasting.

And that, on the contrary, the wicked shall be driven away as accursed, and thrust down to outer darkness, and into the everlasting pains of hell, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched;

and that they shall have not any prospect of hope, comfort, or redemption.

These, as briefly stated above, are the chief articles of their general Christian faith, which they teach and practise universally in their churches and among their members, which in their conviction are the only true Christian faith, which the apostles taught, nay testified with their death, and some also sealed with their blood; wherein they willingly abide, live, and die, that they may with them attain to salvation by the grace of the Lord.

Respecting the statistical part of this sketch, it becomes necessary to say, that they never deemed themselves at liberty to keep an accurate account of their members; because they do not wish to make a great display respecting their numbers, but they believe all that is necessary, is to have their names recorded in the book of life; and because they read (2 Sam. xxiv. and 1 Chron. xxi.) that the anger of the Lord was kindled against David for numbering his people, so that he sent a pestilence which destroyed seventy thousand.

The number of churches, however, that have been organized in different parts of the country, are as follows:

Lancaster county—where the reformation first commenced—Montgomery county, Dauphin county, Cumberland county, Franklin county, Pennsylvania; Richland and Wayne counties, Ohio; Wayne county, Indiana; Erie county, and Livingston county, New York; and in the province of Canada; besides which, there are numbers scattered through the adjoining counties, that have never been regularly organized.

The churches above stated are all provided with ministers, deacons, pastors, &c.

MILLENARIANISM.

BY THE REV. JOHN S. EBAUGH,
OF THE REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

I. THE history of Millenarianism is essentially as old as the sacred scriptures. And hence, as the light of divine revelation gradually increased, even to the completion of the canon of the sacred volume, in the same degree did the views of the Church of God, both under the Old and New Testaments, become more distinct and definite on this important subject.

This doctrine was professed with great distinctness by the Jewish Church, during the three centuries preceding the incarnation of the Saviour; but their radical error consisted in their mental vision and feelings being entirely absorbed in the contemplation of those prophecies which describe, in such glowing colours, the glory and triumph which shall attend his appearance and reign as the anointed King of Zion, on his second advent, when he will come to reign and not to suffer, having once suffered for all, as the substitute and surety of sinners, so as to make an end of sin, and bring in an everlasting righteousness by the death of the cross.

Hence it was that the Jews (with comparatively few exceptions) overlooked or misapprehended those predictions, which so emphatically describe the sufferings and humiliation consequent upon his first advent, even from the manger of Bethlehem to the accursed cross on ever-memorable Calvary.

And that these were the doctrines of the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles, is clearly evident from the whole tenor of their writings, as contained in the New Testament. And hence the frequency and urgency of their exhortations to their hearers, to make due preparation to meet their Saviour, when the voice shall be heard, "Behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him!"

These were also the doctrines of the primitive Church of Christ, for the whole of the three first centuries of its history, insomuch that

it was accounted flagrant heterodoxy by the great mass of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, to attempt to deny it.

But some time after this period, these views of sacred scripture became gradually obscured by the workings of the Man of Sin, the spirit of Antichrist, until these doctrines were at length buried, as it were, under the idle and God-dishonouring rites and ceremonies of the baptized heathenism which constituted the service of the Church of Rome.

In this condition matters remained during the lapse of centuries commonly known as the dark ages of nominal Christendom, excepting in the valleys of Piedmont, by the Waldenses and Albigenses, who constituted, without a doubt, the true Church of Christ, during those dire ages of antichristian darkness.

But in the glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century, the Bible was released from its long confinement in the antiquated convent, and, by its illuminating rays, these precious doctrines of the Millennium were again revived, and in their diffusion gave life and animation to the Church of Immanuel.

For that these doctrines were held by the Reformers, and their successors for centuries after the Reformation, no one can doubt who is acquainted with their writings.

So that Whitby, who lived a century after the Reformers had gone home to glory, may be justly considered as the great Coryphæus of introducing in the Protestant church a system of spiritualizing the prophecies, to such an extent as to leave little to be anticipated in relation to the personal reign of great David's greater Son, on the throne of his father David, as King of Zion.

But, even through this period of the church's history, many of the most gigantic minds and brightest luminaries of the different branches of the Church of Christ, held these views of Christian doctrine.

Such, for instance, as the majority of the members, who composed that august body, known as the Westminster Assembly of Divines, the profoundly learned Mr. Mead, Bishops Newton, Tillotson, Toplady, Sir Isaac Newton, Dr. Gill, and a host of others who lived in the last and preceding centuries.

But it was not until within the last twenty years, that these doctrines have claimed the special attention of many of the great and good, both of European and American churches, so that they have, and do even now, number among their advocates many of the most distinguished divines of the present age.

Such as Dr. Chalmers, the late Rev. Robert Hall of Bristol, the Hon. Messrs. Noels, Rev. Messrs. Bickerstiths, Brooks, Anderson,

Cunningham, Pollock, Habersham, Woodworth, McNeils, and many other transatlantic names of renown.

And in our own country we find among the advocates of the personal reign of Christ on the earth, during the Millennium, such persons as Bishops McIlvain, Henshaw, Hopkins and Ives, Drs. Broadhead, Duffield, McCarty, Andrews, Tyng, Breckenridge, Forsyth, Lillies, Lindsey, Shimeall, Winebrenner, and upwards of three hundred other divines distinguished for their zeal and learning in the different evangelical branches of the Church of Christ in these United States of America.

II. We proceed now, according to our prescribed arrangement, to give an outline of the doctrines properly denominated Millenarian.

But in doing this, we must premise that, like every other great system of truth, these doctrines are received by their advocates and professors with some shades of difference of opinion as to their minute details, whilst they agree in the main and fundamental truths of the system.

The doctrines pertaining to the millennial reign of the Messiah on earth, are in substance as follows :

1. That the Lord Jesus Christ will come again in like manner as he ascended into heaven, at the commencement of the Millennium, at which time the sign of the coming of the Son of Man, as he himself declares, will be as suddenly manifested as the lightning's glance, and in such a manner that every eye shall behold it.

2. Upon the appearance of the Saviour in all the refulgence of his glorified human nature, as the anointed King of Zion, his voice will penetrate all the receptacles of all the righteous dead who have fallen asleep in Christ, from righteous Abel, down to the youngest son or daughter of the Lord Almighty, and consisting of all kindreds, nations, tongues, and people, under the whole heavens; and hearing his voice they will all arise, and come forth from their respective resting-places, and be conformed unto the glorious body of the Redeeming Saviour, as members of the first resurrection, so clearly predicted in the twentieth chapter of the Revelations, and as that better resurrection, to attainment of which the Apostle Paul used such unremitted diligence.

Immediately after this resurrection, those who are yet found in the body, having been regenerated by the grace and spirit of God, and being thus united to Christ, will be changed in the twinkling of an eye, and together with the risen dead, will include all the members of his

elect church, or his bride, or the Lamb's wife; and as such will be caught up to him in the air.

At this juncture of the concerns of the human family, the declaration of the Saviour will be literally fulfilled, namely, that "Two shall be grinding at the mill, the one shall be taken and the other left," &c. The meaning of which passage certainly is, that those individuals, in families, who are found in the Lord, shall on his appearing be changed immediately into a state of happy immortality, and thus be caught up to meet the Bridegroom of their souls; while those who are found on that occasion in their natural state, will be left behind as the inhabitants of the earth.*

* While the Saviour and his saints who are caught up to meet him in the air, thus remain together, as the united bride and royal Bridegroom, in midheaven, is it not probable, from many analogies found in the Bible, especially in the forty days of Moses, for instance, communing with God on Mount Sinai; the forty days of the spies in the land of Canaan; the forty years of the Israelites journeying through the wilderness to Canaan; the temptation of Christ in the wilderness for forty days; the rains descending from heaven for forty days and forty nights, by which the antediluvian world of the ungodly was drowned, and other instances of a similar nature; judging, I say, from such analogies, is it not highly probable that the Saviour, together with all the members of his elect church, will occupy their station in the air or midheaven for something like forty years, during which period the tribes of Israel may all return to Palestine, rebuild Jerusalem, and by reason of the great multitudes returning to take possession of the country solemnly promised by God to Abraham, (for it is a remarkable fact, that this wonderful people are, notwithstanding their manifold persecutions, more numerous and more wealthy, at present, than they ever were since the call of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees to the present day, numbering, if we include ten so long lost tribes of Israel, recently found in Bucharía, Thibet, and Cashmere, and consisting of more than eight millions of souls, together with the tribe of Judah and half tribe of Benjamin, consisting of upwards of five millions more, making, in all, upwards of thirteen millions;) I say, when these multitudes all return, and in fulfilment of God's promise, in the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel, are planted on the mountains of Israel, how well will their swelling numbers tend to fulfil the sure prediction of God's spirit by the mouth of the prophet, Then shall the people of Israel say: The land is too straight for us, and they shall occupy the whole of the original grant to Abraham, of all the country from the river of Egypt to the great sea, and to the river Euphrates?

And thus becoming a great and notable people in point of location, of riches, and numbers, how naturally may these combined circumstances excite the jealousy of the surrounding nations of the earth so as to bring about precisely the awful scenes so graphically described in the fourteenth chapter of Zechariah: when all nations shall be gathered together, to fight against Jerusalem; and in the midst of which tumult, blood, and carnage, the Lord shall come, and all his saints with him, when he shall gird on his great sword, and drive on conquering and to conquer, until his own right arm procures the final victory over all his combined enemies; expels Satan and all his legions from the earth, and introduces the golden age of millennial glory.

But let us take another view of this momentous subject. At the first resurrection, which shall take place, immediately after the sign of the coming of the Son of Man

3. During the time that the Saviour, together with all the members of the first resurrection, and those members of his mystical body which have just passed through their living change, are together in the air, this world will undergo a great change, in which the atmospheric heavens, as well as the earth, will be purged from their defilements, and both be restored, in a great degree, to their paradisaical beauty and loveliness; during which process, God will find some, to us at present unknown, way of preserving a portion of the human family from these desolating judgments and convulsions in the earth, as he saved Noah and his family in the ark, so as to prevent this world from being entirely depopulated.

4. This earth having thus been prepared, the Lord Jesus Christ, together with all his saints, will descend to this earth in circumstances of awful grandeur; such as are described in Daniel vii. 9-14, and in Zechariah xiv. 4; in which passages it is expressly declared, that he, as the Son of Man, shall come, accompanied by his militant thousands of attendants, to take possession of a universal kingdom over all the earth; and that "His feet, in that day, shall stand on Mount Olivet."

When he is thus revealed from heaven, every eye shall see him, and especially the family of Abraham, who shall have been gathered home to Palestine, shall then look upon him as the august personage whom they and their fathers pierced, and they shall then mourn in all the ingenuousness of that godly sorrow which shall never be repented of; and the momentous inquiry shall then be affirmatively answered, which is made by God's inspired* prophet: "Have a nation been born in a day?" For in that day shall all the united tribes of Judah and Israel turn with full purpose of heart unto the Lord, and constitute the happy and loyal subjects of Messiah's kingdom.

5. The law of Christ and the glad tidings of his kingdom shall

shall appear in heaven, all the righteous who have ever lived on the earth, and those then found in the body, shall be taken away from the earth, and those who are left behind are all in their natural state of enmity and rebellion against God and his anointed Son, and we may therefore well imagine into what a vortex of rioting, rapine, and heaven-insulting rebellion, the nations of the earth will speedily plunge, when the righteous, who have ever salted and savoured the earth, are all taken home, the restraining grace of God withdrawn, and Satan, as the prince of the power of the air, brings all his machinations to work in the hearts of the children of disobedience. So that through such concomitant circumstances the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, may soon be revealed, and nation shall meet nation in mad and fell encounter, and thus go on awfully verifying the sure word of prophecy, that they shall go on overturning and overturning, and overturning, until he comes, with all his saints, whose right it is to reign?

then go out anew from Jerusalem, rebuilt through the instrumentality of this new-born nation of missionaries; and all the world will be speedily filled with the saving knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the great deep: insomuch that it will no longer be necessary to make the inquiry, "Know ye the Lord?" "For all shall know him, from the greatest even to the least."

6. The Man of Sin, and all that exalteth itself against God and his anointed Son, having been "destroyed by the breath of his mouth and the brightness of his appearing," the Saviour will sway his triumphant sceptre, and reign King of all nations, as he now reigns King of Saints.

A pure theocracy will thus be established over the whole earth, and the primeval communion and intercourse of Eden, will in a great measure be restored between earth and heaven, so that the vision of the patriarch Jacob, in which he saw "the angels of God descending from heaven to earth, and ascending from earth to heaven," will be literally fulfilled; as also the declaration of him who spake as never man spake, namely: "Hereafter ye shall see the heavens opened and the angels of God descending to and ascending from the Son of Man."

"Jerusalem shall then be created a rejoicing, and her people a joy;" insomuch that the voice of weeping shall no more be heard therein, nor the voice of crying.

7. Antediluvian longevity will be restored during the period of the Millennium to the inhabitants of the earth, so that, according to the assurance given us by the Spirit of God in the sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, "The child shall die an hundred years old,"—that is, the person who dies, during that happy age of millennial blessedness, at the age of an hundred years, will be considered as having died in his childhood. For, "as the days of a tree, are the days of my people," which, according to the best testimony, is from 800 to 1000 years in Palestine.

And so universally shall peace and prosperity prevail throughout the teeming millions of earth's happy inhabitants, during the Millennium, "That there shall be none to hurt, nor to destroy in all God's holy mountain;" for even the wild beasts, and all irrational creatures, will be subdued and brought to dwell in peace and harmony together, as they did in Eden before the apostacy of man.

For, "the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox."

8. The works of the devil will be completely destroyed, and Satan with all his legions will be driven from the earth and be confined in

the prison-house of despair, during the period of the Millennium; so that he be despoiled of every vestige of his dominion as the present god of this world, and prince of the power of the air.

9. All the inhabitants of the earth, who are converted from sin to holiness, after the coming of Christ to reign as King of Zion, shall be known by the appellation of the subjects of the Messiah's kingdom, in contradistinction to the members of his elect Church, consisting of the risen and changed or immortalized saints; the members of which, as his bride, are perfected in graces, beauty and holiness, and prepared for the Messiah, as the royal bridegroom at his coming.

10. The great metropolis of the Messiah's kingdom on the earth will be the New Jerusalem in Palestine, as it is most meet for him to reign where he once suffered all the contradictions of sinners, combined with the assaults of all the powers of darkness, and the dregs of divine displeasure and wrath against the sins of mankind, and thus poured forth a price, all price beyond, in laying down his life as a ransom for his Church and kingdom.

But although the Messiah, as King of Zion, together with his saints who shall reign with him in glory, shall establish Jerusalem as the capital of their conjoint reign during the Millennium,—still we do not believe that they will be confined to Jerusalem, or any other part of the earth.

For we must bear in mind that the Saviour and all the members of his mystical body, the elect Church, shall, according to Christ's own declaration, be like or equal to the angels of heaven, and that they may therefore pass with inconceivable swiftness, to any part of Jehovah's vast dominions, as shall most conduce to the declaratory glory of the Triune God, and best promote the interests of the intelligent universe.

For instance, they may bear to all realms of Jehovah's vast empire the intelligence of the experiment made by the inhabitants of earth, of apostacy, and foul rebellion against God and his anointed Son; and the (to all worlds astounding) manner in which this opposition to the sway of Jehovah's sceptre was subdued by the death of God's own incarnate Son, on the accursed cross; insomuch that the cross of Christ, on ever-memorable Calvary, shall for ever remain the central focus of the glory of the God, man, Mediator. And this may prove the means in the hand of God, of confirming all intelligent beings in the universe, (excepting those confined for ever in the prison-house of hell,) in their loyalty and allegiance to the throne of the Eternal.

11. The undisturbed and universal reign of the Messiah will endure through the whole period of the Millennium, so that there will be none

to dispute his right to reign; but at the end of this long and happy period, Satan will be loosed for a little season, and will go abroad in the earth to deceive all nations.

And whereas even during the Millennium, mankind will not be born immaculate or holy, but only become holy through the grace and Spirit of God in early life: so during that little season in which Satan will be set at liberty, he will bring to bear all his satanic influences upon the minds of the children of men, so as to seduce many of them, as he did our first parents in paradise, to apostatize from their allegiance to God and his Son, the reigning Messiah.

And in process of time Satan will thus collect a mighty army from all parts of the earth, who, with Satan as their leader, will undertake to dispute the sceptre of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the reigning King of Zion; and when all his legions are marshalled in battle array, and are ready for their onset upon the camp of Zion, fire will come down from heaven, and at once consume and overwhelm them all in one common destruction.

12. This utter discomfiture of Satan and all his hosts having been summarily accomplished, the blast of Michael the archangel's trumpet will awaken all the sleeping dead; when all the righteous who died during the Millennium, and all the wicked who had ever lived on the earth, will arise from their graves, as members of the second resurrection; and they will all be congregated before the great white throne of judgment, before which a final adjustment of all the concerns of men and angels will be made; at which time the righteous will be welcomed by the Judge of the quick and the dead, to enter into life eternal, as the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world.

And at the same time also, the wicked will be doomed to depart, as accursed, into that fire prepared for the devil and his angels; and they shall go away into everlasting punishment; and even death and hell will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone for ever.

Immediately upon these final allotments of the righteous and the wicked, a fiery stream will issue forth from the judgment-throne, which will set on fire the deep foundations of the earth, and speedily wrap in one general conflagration every part of land and ocean contained in this terrestrial globe; whilst the atmospheric heavens shall likewise be dissolved with fervent heat, and pass away with a great noise, according to the express prediction of God by the mouth of the Apostle Peter.

In this process the earth will be thoroughly purified from all the pollutions of sin, and every effect of the curse consequent upon man's

apostacy; and a new earth and new heavens will arise, phoenix-like, from the ashes of the old, more beautiful than ever, and in which shall dwell righteousness for evermore. For thus says God's Spirit, (2 Peter iii. 7,) "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and the perdition of ungodly men." And, (2 Peter iii. 13,) "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Here the curtain of time drops!—revelation ceases!—and all beyond the awful scenes of the judgment-day—that great and notable day of the Lord, in which the Lord Jesus Christ will deliver up the kingdom to the Father, lay down his mediatorial office, and God become all in all—I say, all beyond this final winding up of the affairs of angels and men, belongs to the untold realities of vast eternity!

III. The number of those Christians who hold substantially the foregoing views of the Millennium, cannot be computed with any degree of certainty; but from the writings of distinguished divines, both in the European and American churches, we are warranted in estimating their number at many thousands already; and according to the sure word of prophecy, we are led to believe that the time is at hand, when these views will become universally prevalent throughout the habitable globe.

For, according to the signs of the times, the developement of most astounding events in reference to the coming of the kingdom of God, are just at hand, even at the door. "Even so, come, Lord Jesus! come quickly!" Amen!

REFERENCES.

Those who are desirous of making themselves more minutely acquainted with the views of the Millenarians, are affectionately advised to consult a periodical called the "Literalist," a republication of the works of many of the master spirits of Europe; and we would also refer them to Dr. George Duffield on "Prophecy," and his reply to Professor Stewart, of Andover; Bishop Henshaw, and Dr. Breckenridge, on the "Millennium;" Rev. Mr. Shimeall on the "Age of the World;" Rev. John Lillie, on "The Perpetuity of the Earth;" Judge Jones, on "Prophecy Interpreted Literally," &c.; Rev. Mr. Ramsey on the "Coming of Christ;" and other kindred works on this delightful and important subject.

NEW JERUSALEM,

OR

NEW CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY A LAYMAN OF THAT DENOMINATION.

THIS body of Christians receives the doctrines and theological writings of the late Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg, as a rational and authoritative exposition of Scripture. Before proceeding to a sketch of its doctrines, it is proper to premise, that this church refuses to be regarded as one of the many different sects into which the general body of Christians is unhappily divided; but claims, as the name imports, to be an entirely new dispensation of doctrinal truth, as compared with any of the systems which at present prevail.

“A new church!” will the reader exclaim in wonder or indignation: “Where’s the necessity?” And we meet the inquiry at the threshold. The reasons are many. We can here cite but a few—and even these cannot be given without reference to opinions of other Christians, from which we dissent. We would, therefore, premise that we desire such reference and such dissent may not be interpreted into any want of respect to their holders as such; since erroneous opinions may be innocently adopted or retained, although there has been no full collation of conflicting systems.

There was a time when the followers of our Lord were of one heart and one *mind*; but now we see them hopelessly sundered into Romanists on the one hand, and Greeks and Protestants on the other; and the latter rent into many-coloured and uncompromising factions. And if there be a temporary or seeming union among them, neutral spectators still think or fear, that it is not because they love each other more, but Rome less. What is the object of any church, but to preserve and propagate the truth for the sake of good? And has the former Christian church done this? While we acknowledge with Protestants, that it had become utterly corrupt in doctrine and practice before the Reformation, the radical differences among themselves show that they cannot

all be right; nor will it avail to assert that they agree in fundamentals. We know of no such accordance in any one doctrine, either as to the nature of God, the character and wants of man, the mode of divine interposition, or the inspiration of the Scriptures. Granting that each sect has retained some truth,—and were there not a portion in the worst, we should not, as we do, see good men in every one,—the true *system* of doctrine has been lost; the true ideal of Christian character has been forgotten, if it was ever fully known, and men were left to suppose that this religion was incompatible with rational pleasure and manly dignity or virtue. Christianity lies in ruins, and the life of its several fragments is only that of the segments of a polypus, hopeless of reunion. And it must be owned, that, if we are to look for nothing better in the future than the past, it has proved a failure. The adulterous connexion with the state early led to its corruption, and to the reproach that Catholicism, like the Koran, if not propagated, has at least been maintained, by policy and the sword. Remonstrants were denounced under the name of heretics—their tenets and apologies suppressed with them. Some fragments, even now, lay more stress on church government and obedience to authority, than on knowledge; and all insist more on faith than on works. Reason has been discarded as an enemy, and mystery received into alliance. As a natural consequence, the ablest minds have become infidel, or indifferent to religion as a personal affair; or, seeing that society cannot subsist without it, they yield a formal and political support, while the feeble have been inflamed to fanaticism.

The clergy have sometimes complained of the slight esteem in which their order is held where not patronized by the state, and of the opposition they encounter where they are. Not to mention their demeanour towards opponents and their unwavering regard to their corporate interests, we think they need look no farther than to their own dogmas, to account for the decline of reverence for their sacred function. We do not say that their lives are spent *operose nihil agendo*; for any religion which does not discourage good morals is better than none; but they do reap an immature and stunted harvest, themselves being judges. Men will not freely bestow even on spiritual rulers the fruits of their labours without an adequate return. Why is it, that, after eighteen centuries, Mahommedism is more extended than Christendom, and Heathenism more than either? Nay, why did Mahommed rise at all? and why is the conversion of his followers so hopeless, and the missionary crippled in his efforts at every turn? Why are irresponsible societies left to discharge the duty of the Church? It is, that those who had the control of religion “DID NOT UNDERSTAND HIS

WORD." "THEY ERRED, NOT KNOWING THE SCRIPTURES, OR THE POWER OF GOD."

But if we concede for a moment the purity of what is taught, it is inadequate to the increased demand of the general mind. Men outgrow the garments of their youth. Philosophy and religion are in unnatural conflict. We need a new developement of Christianity, in which all parts of knowledge shall assume their proper position. We have no clear views in the fundamentals of all religion, as distinguished from those of the wiser Heathen and Deists. They believe in one God, the immortality of the soul, and retribution; and the prevalent systems throw us back on their insufficient ideas. Or rather, we are fain to believe that, with advancing time, we know less and less of the truth. If our present teachers know all that is necessary, free of error, why is it that the good and wise do not see it? and if either Protestant or Catholic is entitled to exclusive ascendancy, why has Providence permitted neither to attain it?

Again, however opposed to the received opinion, we think that Scripture clearly teaches us that "the earth abideth for ever."* Can we suppose, then, that our benevolent Teacher will permit the existing state of doubt and distraction to be also perpetuated, and never interpose for our relief? Why should he not? Every founder of a sect, every believer in a Millennium, in effect, says, that he may. He has no where told us that he would never clear up the mysteries of his Word. To do so would but be in accordance with the progressive character of all former dispensations, which were given as necessity arose. If Moses and the Prophets have been so perverted that they cannot be understood: there cannot occur a more fitting occasion for divine interference than the present; when the hearts of men are failing them for fear, and when many are looking and praying for such a blessing; though some, when it is offered, refuse it, with a strange perverseness, as *inconsistent with ideas which prevail*.

But the one sufficient reason is reserved to the last. Said our Lord to his disciples while on earth, "I have many things to say unto

* Ecc. i. 4; Ps. lxxii. 17; lxxviii. 69; lxxxix. 35-37; xevi. 10; xciii. 1; civ. 5; cxxv. 1; cxix. 90; cxlviii. 6; (2 Sam. vii. 16; Isa. ix. 7; Dan. ii. 44; vii. 14, 27; Micah iv. 5, 7; Comp. Luke i. 33 and Rev. xi. 15.) Every Greek scholar knows that the phrase "end of the world" in Matt. xiii. 39; xxiv. 30; xxviii. 20; should be translated "consummation of the age." Peter, who (Acts ii. 16-20.) had explained similar language of the prophet Joel as fulfilled on the *day of Pentecost*, in his 2d Epistle iii. 7-10, has reference to the above words of our Lord; of course to be fulfilled in a similar manner, as also wherever it is used in the prophetic style. Matt. v. 18, Luke xvi. 17, and the like, declare, by a strong Hebraism, of two events that *both* are equally improbable; so that the passages just cited retain their literal import.

you, but ye cannot bear them *now*. . . . The time cometh . . . when I shall show you *plainly* of the Father." (John xvi. 12-25.) Himself had predicted the decline of that dispensation, and its utter overthrow from its foundations; and that he would come again. (Matt. xxiv.) And the prophet of the future fortunes of the Church saw in vision "the Holy City, New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven, like a bride adorned for her husband;"—"the tabernacle of God with *men*." (Rev. xxi. 1-5.) "The kingdoms of *this world* become the kingdoms of our Lord." (xi. 15.) It is for the fulfilment of this promise, that we believe all things are now ready. It is for this hope's sake, nay, confidence, that he *has* come—not in person, as many are even now looking for him—but in the *power* and *glory* of the spiritual meaning of his Word, which has heretofore been *clouded* by the literal sense, that we are denounced as enthusiasts or worse. Is a prophecy ever understood until accomplished? When he does come, is it probable that the world in general will be aware either of the fact or mode of his appearance; or believe it, if true? (Matt. xxiv. 44; Luke xviii. 8.)

In all religious inquiries, the principal object should be the *knowledge of God*. As, if clear ideas are wanting here, all subsequent reasoning is darkened and perplexed, if not entirely vitiated. We suppose few will be found at the present day to deny, at least in words, that God is one, and God is good; and that this is discoverable from his works. But the Christian is asked yet another question,—and surely when aided by revelation, his answer should be full and exact,—“Who then was that dread, mysterious one that walked the earth more than eighteen centuries since, whose appearance was the signal for a contest of opinions, which has widened and extended to our own day?” We do not care, even if our space permitted, to rake into ecclesiastical history, among the ashes of forgotten heresies, whose authors “would not have this man to reign over them.” Let us descend to more recent times. The master himself, when here, inquired of his disciples, “What think ye of Christ?” and the question is re-echoed through the long tract of ages. “He is one of three divine *persons*, each of whom is *by himself* God,” says the Athanasian. “Be it so,” says the Arian, “if you grant that his is a *derived* divinity.” “He is one three *somewhats*,” says the mathematical! Dr. Wallis. Sirs, we do not understand you; nor can we accompany the logic which would put a difference between three separate divine *persons*, and three distinct gods! “Your objection is natural,” says Priestley; “he was a good man: a prophet, if you will: but still the son of Joseph and Mary, and naturally fallible and peccable as you

or I." "I go farther," says Mr. Belsham, "and assert that his too partial biographers may have suppressed certain portions of his *private* history, which would have proved him *actually* guilty of common frailties." Sirs, your statement is intelligible; but it contradicts the general tenor and many express declarations of Scripture. "We would offend neither prejudice nor reason," says the transcendental Unitarian; "we believe in but one God, and neither affirm nor deny the divinity of Christ; but we do accept him as our teacher." Very good apology for a lover of mystery, all of whose honours, however, *you* disclaim. "We are not required to express an opinion," says John Locke, or Alexander Campbell; "sufficient it is, if we believe, with the primitive Christians, that Jesus is the Messiah, the Saviour of the world." Very well, and who is the Messiah?

It is plain, that, on a point of such importance, statements so various or inadequate cannot be satisfactory to all minds. And should any unsatisfied inquirer put the question to us, we answer, without ambiguity, equivocation, evasion or reserve, *He was God manifest in the flesh*. We know, we conceive of, we worship no other; we pray to no other for his sake. We have an apostle's assertion that "in him dwells *all the fulness* of the Godhead *bodily*;" and his own, that "whosoever sees *him*, seeth the Father:" and that he hath "*all* power in *heaven* and on earth." The Deist and the Pantheist believe in a God diffused through all space. This is the Christian's God—visible in a human form. The anthropomorphism that is to be shunned, is not that which ascribes body and parts to the Deity, (for the human form is the original type from which all organized forms are degradations,) but the malignant passions of anger, wrath, and revenge, from which, surely one being in the universe ought to be exempt.

But farther—what was the true character of man, and the occasion of God's becoming incarnate? "He is wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body;" says a particular creed; "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil." Even if not a reflection on his Maker, does not this statement leave man irresponsible? "The new-born infant," says the Pelagian, "is as pure as was the first man before the fall—the consequences of whose sin are confined to his own person." If so, what need of a Redeemer? and why do all inevitably degenerate?

To return—what did he do on our behalf while here? and what connexion is there between his obedience and sufferings and our benefit? "He died that he might rise again," and "thus bring life and immortality to light," says the Unitarian; and so far truly. "He died

to exhibit God's hatred of sin," says Dr. Murdock. "He did *something*," says Coleridge, "we do not and cannot know *what*, beyond its effects; and it is not proper that the various metaphors by which Paul would illustrate the manifold consequences of the redemptive act, should be set up as separate and substantive doctrines." "Some have attempted to account for it, but we do not perceive that it is explained in Scripture," says Bishop Butler, with the modesty of a great man who was *not* a dogmatist. "How is this," says the rigidly orthodox, "need any thing be plainer? *Our salvation was bought and sold*. Man having disobeyed the law, its honour required that punishment should fall somewhere, to avert the wrath of the Father, who could not else be just and merciful. The son of God undertook to *mediate* between us and the Father, became incarnate, obeyed, suffered *penally* and *in our stead*; and thus paid the *infinite debt* we had contracted to the law. It is not altogether certain whether he paid it to the Law, the Father, or the devil; but he rose, ascended, and now *intercedes* with the Father, for the sake of his *merits*, wounds and *sufferings*, to have mercy on the *elect*, who, if they will only *believe* all this, will have their sins blotted out, and his merits *imputed* to them," &c. It is impossible to enumerate all the objections which justly lie against this whole alleged proceeding. Enough, that no ingenuity can reconcile it, either with the unity of the Deity or his attribute of justice. Nor are we singular in rejecting it as having no foundation either in reason or Scripture properly interpreted. We regret that we can only glance at what we would offer in lieu thereof, as the true doctrine, and which is largely dwelt on in the writings of our author; and, in order to this, the reader will pardon a slight apparent digression.

All things in the universe, which are according to divine order, have relation to goodness or truth; those which have departed from this order, to evil or falsehood. God himself is love and wisdom, the correlatives of the two former, (1 John iv. 8; v. 6; John xiv. 6;) and this is that likeness in which man was created. The constituents of the human mind are the will and the understanding; the former, the seat of the affections—the latter of the thoughts. And the soul itself is not an ethereal vapour, nor a bundle of ideas or of faculties, nor simply the result of bodily organization; but a substantial form (the *image* of God) receptive of goodness and truth, which are spiritual light and heat, from their source; or of their opposites from below. When the internal man has been deformed from the latter cause, the great object of *regeneration* is to restore its lost symmetry. This is the grand end of Providence in maintaining a church on

earth; and all minor events are overruled to its furtherance. The Platonic idea, that, "As beauty is the virtue of the body, so virtue is the beauty of the mind," and which has been regarded as a rhetorical metaphor, is thus a most emphatic truth. And ideas themselves are not the airy, evanescent things, the intangible abstractions, set forth by modern metaphysicians; but may and ought to be presented to the mental eye in corresponding forms, and thus they do appear in that world which is freed from the trammels of time and space.

We gather from the allegorical language of the first chapters of Genesis, that the early race of men on this earth held direct communication with their Maker, who either taught them what was for their good by a sensible internal dictate, or enabled them to read it in the outward creation, whose significance was then understood; that, in the use of freedom and reason, without which they would not have been men, and which they exercised *as if* from themselves, they attained a high degree of wisdom and virtue; that, although these, together with life itself, were gifts *continually* received from Jehovah, *by virtue of their union with him*, in process of time, and *because* it did not so appear to them, they began to call this in question, and fell at length into the amazing fallacy that these were all their own and *self-derived*. HERE WAS THE ORIGIN OF EVIL. Is it asked, "Why was this permitted?" we answer, "It could not have been prevented without the destruction of mankind." Sin is necessarily incidental to every probationary system. Until we upset the axiom, "That it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time," it is no derogation from Omnipotence to say, that it could not do things so contradictory as to convert man into a machine and still preserve his freedom. We do not suppose that the fall was sudden or total, but the degeneracy was gradual; and in time it became necessary, in order to his preservation, that the relation of man to his Maker should be changed. The immediate intercourse was now suspended as dangerous, and all the communion from thence forward to the incarnation was through the intervention of an angel. (Gen. xlviii. 16; Ex. iii. 2; xxiii. 20-23; Is. lxiii. 9; Heb. xii. 29.) To meet his successive declensions, and continue the possibility of salvation, successive churches were provided of Divine Providence—the germ of a new one, before its predecessor had become corrupt or inadequate. Throughout this long interval, the free-will of man, which consisted in his being placed *in equilibrio* between good and evil spiritual influences, with power to yield to either, was preserved. Still the ungrateful, reckless race, having once turned their backs on the Sun, wandered farther into the gloom—forgot their God—sunk to

the lowest depth consistent with humanity, when liberty itself was threatened by a preponderance of the evil influence, which, from oppressing the spirits, had come to possess the very *bodies* of men! And did their merciful Parent desert them here? Alas! the creatures had hurt themselves, and not him, by their folly. In this extremity it was,—this “fulness of time” which he had foreseen,—that *himself* became incarnate as divine truth, restored in his own person the true exemplar of humanity, conquered the hells, which could not else be reached without destruction to all concerned, and thus rendered salvation for ever possible to all men on all earths without danger of their again falling into a like abyss. Then it was that all things necessary were *done*, though then they could not be seen in the fulness of light. But all may see it *now*. This is the love which demands our eternal gratitude; this the condescension of the Supreme which we contemplate with wonder and with awe.

We say then, that we know of no son of God born from eternity. That title should alone be predicated of the human nature born in time, (Luke i. 35,) at first properly termed the son of Mary, though afterwards changed. Physiologists know that a man receives his soul from his father, and his body from his mother. As the latter was produced without the intervention of an earthly father, (Luke i. 20–25,) our Lord could have had nothing corresponding with a human soul; but was animated directly by the Divinity instead. (Mal. iii. 1; com. John ii. 21; Heb. x. 5.) We likewise believe that the human mind has three several degrees; the *natural*, serving as the basis of the other two, which are successively opened. His body or humanity, including the natural mind, being derived from an imperfect mother, partook of her infirmity, (Job xiv. 4,) was subject to temptation; (Matt. iv. 1–8; xxii. 18; Heb. iv. 15; com. Jas. i. 13, and Ex. xxxiii. 20,) and had tendency to sin. It was by submitting to temptation in all possible variety, and by a successful resistance in every case, that this human nature was perfected, (Heb. ii. 10, 18,) glorified, (John xiii. 31, 32; xvii. 15; xii. 27, 28; Luke xxiv. 26,) or made divine. This process was *gradual*, (Luke ii. 40, 52,) and any seeming difference between the Father and himself was previous to its completion. Indeed, his whole life was a combat with an infernal influence, (Isa. lxiii. 1–9; lxix. 16, 17, 20; Jer. xlv. 5, 10; Ps. xlv. 4–7; John xii. 31; xvi. 11; xvii. 33; Luke x. 18; Rev. i. 18,) in which he was progressively victorious, not for himself alone, but for man also, in the true principle of overcoming evil with good. The tendency of the soul is generally to assimilate the body to itself. In his case, when the principles of the infirm humanity, with their corresponding forms,

were successively *put off* during temptations, divine forms were put on in their stead. The last temptation was the passion of the cross, when the warfare was finished, (John xix. 30,) and the union between the human and divine nature was complete and reciprocal. (John xvii. 10, 21.) From thenceforth this DIVINE HUMANITY became the fit residence, the appropriate organ through which the Holy Spirit, or *new* divine influence, operates throughout creation. (John vii. 39; xx. 22. And thereafter all appearance of personality separate from the Father is merged in this indissoluble union; or rather, he is *the* person of the Father. (Heb. i. 3.) His sufferings, which had no merit as such, and could not satisfy a benevolent Parent, were not *penal*, nor *substituted*, but merely incidental to his changes of state and his intense anxiety, bordering on despair, during his humiliation, and were endured by him to represent the state of the church at that time, and in all ages, when it rejects or falsifies his truth, and “does despite to the spirit of his grace.” His merit consisted in that exercise of divine power and virtue, whereby he glorified human nature in himself, and healed, restored and elevated it into newness of life in his creatures. This merit or righteousness is a satisfaction to his Father, because it answers the cravings of the divine love within him.

Here, then, is the one God in one person; in whom, nevertheless, we acknowledge a *trinity*; for the Father dwells in the Son, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him, as the divine love dwells in the divine wisdom, and the spirit of truth proceeds from it.

It was ignorance of this *glorification*, which caused most of the heresies which have disgraced ecclesiastical history, arrested the spread of the church, and have shorn it of its best influence where it remained. And yet each individual carries in his own person an analogy which would sufficiently illustrate such a union to the plainest mind. For he possesses a soul, a body, and a power or operative energy, which is the result of the joint action of the other two; and the *regeneration* which we all need, is but an image of that glorification. (Matt. xix. 28.)

To the classical reader we say, that “person” (*persona, per sonans*), originally meant an actor’s *mask*—by transfer, the *character* which he enacted. “Making satisfaction,” is doing enough. “Atonement,” means *reconciliation*, and not the payment of a debt. To “sacrifice” is to make holy, to consecrate, to dedicate; and its essence is not shedding of blood. “Redemption” is recovery from bondage. “To intercede” is to go between; “to mediate,” to serve as a medium “to propitiate,” (*prope ito*), is to make nigh to. “To justify” is to

make just, as clearly as "to sanctify" is to make holy. We rejoice to believe that God appeared in a new aspect or *character* in Christ Jesus; that he has *done enough* for our salvation, by the consecration of his human nature; that he has thus *rescued* us from spiritual slavery; that his divine humanity *goes between* us and the Father; nay, serves as the perpetual *medium* by which we may *draw near* to Him, be *reconciled*, made *just*, and fit for heaven.

The whole Word of God in its *celestial* or highest sense, explains in its progress this most stupendous event that ever occurred in the universe. It is divinely shadowed forth in the lives of the Patriarchs; more clearly in the acts and sufferings of the Prophets; but more particularly in the afflictions of David, the great representer of the Lord, as expressed in the book of Psalms. In the New Testament it is briefly, but plainly asserted.

It was not then any selfish regard "to his own glory," which led to this grand expedient, but "in his *love* and his *pity* he redeemed us." There never was any "conflict" between his attributes. The justice of God is but his goodness in *restorative* action. He does *not* demand the punishment of an innocent substitute. (Gen. xviii. 25; Ez. xviii. 20.) He requires our repentance and reformation alone. (Jer. xviii. 7, 8; Isa. lvi. 7; Luke xxiv. 47-8; Acts v. 30-1; 1 John i. 9.) It is not enough barely to *believe* all this, though true; to repent in extremity; or to confess our sins in the gross. Man must examine himself in detail; fight against his evils in the strength of the Lord; follow the great exemplar; (Matt. x. 38; xvi. 24; xix. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 21-2; John xii. 26; 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18; iv. 16;) and thus, by an union of faith, charity and good works, without attaching any merit to either, "work out his own salvation," or qualify himself for happiness. We know of no shorter road to heaven. A God of truth will not *impute* to us, either the good or evil which was not and could not have been done by us. (Ez. xviii. 20, 21.) And though all are predestinated to heaven, yet none will be forced to accept it; nor will any be *elected* but by that principle of spiritual affinity, which leads those, who are, by reformation and regeneration, made like Him, to choose Him freely and reciprocally. In a reasonable service, man need not be frightened into a slavish compliance; and cannot be *passive*, but must co-operate with his Maker, who continually gives him the power to obey his commands, and provides the means of salvation for all, nay, for the very *Heathen*, who are only responsible for the employment of such advantages as they possess. (John ix. 41; Acts x. 35; Rom. ii. 13-15; v. 13.) Infants, being incapable of sinning, are all saved. (James i. 14, 15; Deut. xxiv. 16;

Matt. xviii. 10, 14.) As the ability to keep the commands is constantly afforded, voluntary *perseverance*, and constant vigilance, are as little as could be expected in turn. Who then can estimate the importance of regeneration, when we reflect that man is by every thought, word, and act of his life drawing his own portrait for eternity!

When death,—which is not in itself a curse, but a natural stage in the progress of man, that terminates his probationary state,—when death once separates the soul from the material body, the latter will never be resumed; (1 Cor. xv. 50; Matt. xxii. 31, 32; Phil. i. 21, 23; Luke xxiii. 43; com. Rev. ii. 7;) and the former rises up a spiritual body, in a spiritual world, adapted to its new and permanent condition. (Luke xvi. 22–4; ix. 30; 1 Cor. xv. 44; Rev. xxii. 8, 9.) Indeed, the spirit is the man himself; and most men, being of mixed character, enter, at death, the intermediate state, or first receptacle of departed spirits. Here dissimulation is not long permitted. The hypocrite is stripped of his mask—erring piety is instructed in the truth. After abiding for a period sufficient to develop the real state, the individual is advanced to heaven, or descends to hell, and becomes an angel or a devil, accordingly. We know of no other classes entitled to those names respectively. (Judg. xiii. 6, 10, 11; Dan. ix. 21; Micah xvi. 5; John xx. 12; Rev. xxi. 17; xxii. 8, 9.) We recognise no other intelligent and rational beings in the universe, but God and the human race in perpetual progress or descent. We cannot conceive of an hybrid, apocryphal, winged order superior to men; least of all would we ascribe, with Milton, some of the highest attributes of divinity to the devil! The two grand divisions of human kind are those which are marked by a preponderance of the affections or of the intellect. Within these limits the modifications of character are innumerable. As many *classes* are formed in the other life, where like consorts with like. Here, too, a like distinction is drawn between the kingdom of the good and the kingdom of the wise. And we are told there are three gradations in each, answering to the three degrees of the mind—affection, intellection, and action, or answering to those angels whose predominating characteristic is respectively love, wisdom, or simple obedience to what is good and true. And analogous differences and grades obtain among the infernals.

Such is a sketch of the principal doctrines which Swedenborg has drawn from the *literal* sense of that book which all Christians acknowledge as the repository of their faith. And we cannot but advert, in this connexion, to the manner in which it has been degraded even by those who claim to think with reverence of it as the charter of

their freedom. We are pained to hear of the poetry of the Hebrews; of the eloquence of this prophet; of the simple or more philosophical narrative of that historian or evangelist. We are indignant at the effects of the clashing principles of biblical criticism and hermaneutics in the hands of German theologians. Do our fellow-Christians know what the boldest of them have conceded to these sappers and miners? have they any definite idea of what inspiration is? of what it is to say of any book that it is the Word of God? We certainly do not believe that all the tracts bound up in our Bible can claim that grand designation; but think we have a criterion for determining the products of the "divine afflatus" from all the works of man.*

The reader has now a specimen of the views of men who are reported to set plates at their tables for their dead friends! and to converse familiarly with Peter and Paul!!—by those who perhaps find it more convenient to divert public attention from this faith than to refute it. We know not how many can be found to credit such dull fictions; but if, among the entire body of receivers of the doctrine taught by Swedenborg, one such voluntary fool could be discovered, it would only prove that he did not understand his own doctrine, which teaches the impossibility of seeing spiritual objects with the natural eye; and declares that the veil between that world and this is never removed except by Providence, and for sufficient reasons.

Would that our space permitted us to fill up the above outline with the rich variety of subaltern truths, at once new and suggestive, with which his works abound, and all of which are germane to the leading doctrines. We leave the rest to the Rev. Wm. Mason, of England, who gives the estimate of this system by a plain but vigorous and undebauched intellect, which had tried several others and examined all:

"Here was a new system of doctrine presented to him, not to be blindly believed, but rationally understood—a system which inculcated the divinity of Jesus Christ without a mystery, and which, nevertheless, rejected the supposed vicarious sacrifice with all its horrors and injustice, and vindicated the Scriptures from the charge

* The books of the Word are the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, the Psalms and all the Prophets in the Old Testament; and the four Evangelists and Revelation in the New. The other books (except the Canticles and Apocrypha) contain the truth—are useful to the church—are written with as high a degree of inspiration as writers generally ascribe to those enumerated, but do not contain the internal sense, in a connected or divine series. The book of Job contains an internal sense, being written according to the science of correspondences, which was known to the ancient people on this earth, but does not come within that connected and intimately related series of divine truths which makes the Word an infinitely complex and harmonious integer.

of setting it forth; a system which gave a new view of the inspiration of the Scriptures, and which, if it could be established by conclusive evidence, would prove them indeed the 'Word of God,' by raising them to that true and real dignity which that magnificent title implies—the dignity of being in every part of it, the repository of infinite goodness and infinite wisdom. A new intellectual and moral world opened upon his delighted view. He found he was able to see the Lord Jesus Christ as '*God over all blessed for ever,*' without qualification, or reservation, and in a clear and glorious light, without a single overshadowing cloud of mystery or contradiction. Without going back to tripersonalism, he could now embrace a new scriptural doctrine of the Divine *Trinity*, and one perfectly free from every blemish of contradiction, and thus could entertain far more exalted ideas of his Saviour than he was ever able to form while he was a believer in the three persons in the Godhead. He could also now see his God as ONE, because one Divine Person, and in the aspect of love and mercy immensely exceeding his utmost efforts so to behold his Maker, while, as a Unitarian, he endeavoured to think of God as a Benevolent Somewhat, diffused like an ethereal essence through infinite space. Indeed, he was delighted to find that whatever is good and useful, whatever is lucid and consistent, in other systems of Christianity, is harmoniously brought together in its proper arrangement and connexion, in the doctrines of the New Church, so that those doctrines may be regarded as embracing all the revealed truths deduced from the Holy Word by all denominations of Christians, purified from all admixture of error and human invention. He found the divine authority and sanction, the unchangeableness of doctrine, and the infallibility of interpretation, which is the boast of the Roman Catholic, combined with the utmost freedom of investigation; so that the general doctrines of the New Church may be regarded as invisible 'bands of love,' (IIos. xi. 4,) by which the Father of mercies holds and guides his children, while he tenderly suffers them freely to expatiate hither and thither into all the particulars involved in the articles of their faith, without wandering away from the grand fundamental principles of all true religion, that *God is one, and God is good*. He found the great principle of the Protestant, that the Scriptures are the only rule of a Christian's faith and practice, earnestly contended for, and yet perfectly harmonized with the Catholic doctrine of authority and uniformity, abstractedly considered. He found that nothing is required to be believed in the New Church, but what may be clearly drawn from, and confirmed by, the literal sense of the Word; and that the important duty of searching the Scriptures, which is thus

individually to be performed, in order to the formation of a real and sincere faith, is blessed with a sure and unerring guidance, which has all the effect of a voice from heaven, while it is congenial with the freest exercise of the understanding, and clear of all mischiefs of priestly dictation, and the liability to contradictory decisions of erring and changeful men. He saw that, while the doctrine of transubstantiation is rejected, the member of the New Church is enabled clearly to discern *how* the Lord is *really* present in the holy supper, without reducing that divine institution to the unspiritual and unmeaning ceremony which it is made to be by some. He found in the New Church an equally determined adherence to the belief of what is thought to be revealed with that which is manifested by Trinitarians, but combined with a clear opening of the mysterious words of Scripture, and which by Trinitarians are implicitly believed without being understood. He found here the freedom of discussion, the demand for reasonable proof, and the determination to believe nothing but what is rationally proved to be true, as instanced in the tone of the Unitarian and Sceptic, but combined with a full and fair answer to that demand, to the full satisfaction of sound reason, acting under the influence of true humility, and a supreme love of what is good and pure and spiritually useful. He found vital and inward religion, so exclusively vaunted by Evangelicals, and the inward waiting on and communion with the Spirit, so much cultivated by the followers of George Fox, here duly regarded and combined with just philosophical views, practical principles, and moral habits, founded in the deepest reverence for the Scriptures, so that the internal affections are thus brought down, and firmly fixed in a corresponding external. He found the supremacy of moral principle and practice over doctrine, as contended for by the moral philosopher and Utilitarian, in full operation under the designation of charity, or the love of use for the Lord's sake; so that the external principle of morality derives interiorly from the spiritual mind, and thus from the Lord, an interior principle of spiritual life, by which it is made spiritually alive, and is exalted to a conjunction with the source of all good. He found an entire and universal reference of all things to God, and which is aimed at by the Predestinarian, accomplished in an enlightened trust in a particular and overruling Providence, resting on clear, rational, and scriptural grounds, and yet perfectly free from all the objections which justly lie against the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination and election, and perfectly reconcilable with human liberty and rationality. He found the doctrine of free-will asserted, and clearly exhibited, without removing man in the least degree from a momentary de-

pendence on the source of life and power. He was enabled to see the origin of moral and physical evil in such a light as to justify the divine goodness, and to make the divine foreknowledge appear perfectly compatible with human freedom and accountability. He perceived that, although man is a fallen creature, he is continually kept in the capability of surmounting his infirmities, and overcoming his evil propensities; and thus he was enabled to obviate the objections of disbelievers in hereditary evil, on the one hand, and the advocates of man's moral incapacity on the other. He saw the Wesleyan doctrine of assurance of salvation rectified, and placed on a rational basis; and the religious feelings, so strongly cultivated by Methodists, not extinguished, but directed into useful and sanctifying channels, so as to be active without enthusiasm on the one hand, and without being impeded on the other, by cold, unprofitable, and barren speculations: thus maintaining a happy medium through the affections of the will and the truths of the understanding, justly and mutually tempering and balancing each other. He saw the belief in the agency of good and evil spirits, called angels and devils, as set forth in the Scriptures, placed on a truly rational and edifying basis, accompanied with clear views of the nature of such agency, and of its varied manifestations; the whole being calculated to guard the man of the church against running into fanaticism and superstition on the one hand, and scepticism on the other. Besides all this, he saw all that is terrible in what is commonly believed concerning hell, rendered more acceptable to the discriminating mind, by a sound explanation, yet without the belief in a future state of retribution being in the least degree impaired in its moral efficacy:—he also saw all that is attractive in what is commonly believed concerning heaven rendered inexpressibly more so, by an explanatory adaptation of heavenly joys to the various affections, faculties and powers of the being who is destined to partake of them. In short he found no point of doctrine strained, or raised out of its proper place, by being cultivated above, or to the neglect of, other points, nor any point unduly depressed or neglected, but all duly and equally regarded, as forming one harmonious whole; he contrasted this keeping of all the points of faith in their proper connexions with each other, with the contrary conduct of the various Christian sects, each of which takes some one point out of its place, and fondly prefers and cherishes it above others, until the whole lose their proper order, harmony, mutual dependence and connexion, and thus become perverted and falsified. And farther, he found he was placed in the fullest liberty to discuss the contents of the Scriptures, without any temptation to warp them, or take the

slightest liberty with them ; because he was blessed with such an infallible rule of interpretation as precluded almost the possibility of his straying into the wilds of error. He saw that, without countenancing the infidel assertion, facts have proved the inefficacy and therefore unsuitability of the Bible to effect the moral improvement of man, he had not been mistaken in his moral estimate of the Christian world ; for according to a testimony that is beyond dispute, the Christian Church, as predicted in the New Testament, has now really come to its end, through evils of life and errors of doctrine ; so that now there is not one stone of the spiritual temple left standing upon another, which has not been thrown down. On every hand there is nothing but a confusion of ideas and doctrines amongst Christian sects, which may fitly be compared to the confusion of tongues at the building of Babel. Doctrines either derogatory to the divine character, or irreverent to the Holy Word, or subversive of morality, are put forth with the utmost confidence of genuine Christianity.

“ But, above all, he was delighted that he had now obtained a solution of all doubts and difficulties attendant on the literal construction of Scripture. He was now able to account for all that before appeared unaccountable ; he was able to understand all that previously seemed incomprehensible ; to reconcile what heretofore appeared utterly contradictory ; and by means of the key he had now obtained to *the spiritual sense which pervaded the whole* ; he was able to see and to *experience*, that ‘ All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfected.’ By means of the divine science of correspondences between things spiritual and natural, now revived by Swedenborg, and agreeably to which, by the providence of their author, the Scriptures have been written, he found he could penetrate the clouds of the literal sense, and behold the spiritual sense which lies concealed therein, and in which the Lord is now making his second and spiritual advent into the souls of those who humbly and thankfully receive Him, with power and great glory. The gates of all creation seemed thrown open to admit him to view the heavenly realities which all natural existences symbolize. Thus could he ‘ look through nature up to nature’s God,’ and equally so in the natural creation and the literal or natural sense of the Scriptures. He now saw the divine goodness and wisdom fully justified, both in the works of God and his Word. All His Providence, and all His dispensations of grace, alike shone before his mental vision, in the fulness of glory and beauty !” (MASON’S JOE ABBOTT.)

Strong and comprehensive language this !—perhaps the reader

may think; and yet all members of the New Church whose opportunities of comparing this creed with others enable them to speak understandingly, could readily adopt it as their own.

The reader will also have seen that, without denying the possibility of salvation to any class of Christians, or even of Mahometans or Heathens, this faith is essentially and intensely Protestant. They, who believe that God himself will not do violence to the will or reason of his creatures, will scarce submit to the dictation of man in the affair of religion. But the past is not, therefore, useless to us. History is not an old almanac; and, in profiting of her lessons, we are not surprised at certain events she records,—some occurring in our own day,—which seem strange to Protestants generally. Without doubt, our thanks are due to those who fought the battles of religious freedom and restored the Word of Life to the world. But here our commendation must stop; for through their imprudence the tide of victory was rolled back when at its height, and more than half the worth of the rescued treasure concealed for ages. Our Huguenot and Pilgrim sires resisted the tyranny of their day; and shall they exercise a posthumous dominion over us? We wonder not then that Erasmus, much as he desired the reformation of the church, should have held himself aloof from the intemperate party which undertook the task; or that Grotius, who had felt their want of moderation, should have returned in spirit to Rome. We wonder not that Turenne, and Condé, and Wallenstein, should have abandoned their Protestant predilections, and thrown their sword into the scale of civil law and political order, against the baneful doctrine of “justification by faith alone,” now the article of a falling church. And when even the daughter of Gustavus yielded her father’s sceptre and her father’s religion to the wants of the heart, or imagination, if you will: we think the leaders of the church should have remembered that “Straws may show the direction of the wind,” and have suspected some sad deficiency in what they had offered as “the whole gospel.” Oxenstiern, who knew “With how little wisdom the world was governed,” did not refer to politics alone. The great, wise, good Sully,—who advised his royal master, (where there was so little to choose between them,) to conform to the faith of his people, while he tolerated dissent,—had he served the English James, would doubtless have dissuaded him from giving “three kingdoms for a mass.” Protestantism has too often warred against the refinements, the charities, the innocent pleasures of life. She has been charged with too great nakedness, and systematically refusing to worship the Lord in “the beauty of holiness;” with favouring a tame mediocrity in all things; and

where not propped by tithes, with being sustained by factitious excitement alone; and can we say, "without ground?" There is needed a comprehensive faith, which shall meet the wants of the great and the little—the intellectual and the feeling—the imaginative and the practical. If invited to enlist under such a banner, would so many of the great Teutonic family of nations, with all their hereditary hatred of the Roman name, have continued submissive to her yoke? Would France have refused such a reform and accepted despotism instead? Would Popish Ireland have continued to this day a thorn in the side of her conqueror? We think not. And to us it seems natural, where both extremes erred so widely, and human nature was so long abused, that there should have been such phenomena as Mysticism, Quietism, and even Jansenism on the one hand,—and Pietism and Methodism on the other. And Puseyism is but an outbreak of the same feeling in a higher sphere. "*All*," [the different Christian churches,] says Hartley, "have left the true, pure, simple religion, and teach for doctrines the commandments of men. They are all merchants of the earth, and have set up a kingdom of this world. They have all a dogmatizing spirit, and persecute such as do not receive their mark, and worship the images which *they* have set up." Seeing, then, that their contemporaries were unworthy of true liberty, and knowing no middle ground, we wonder not that the great souls of Dryden, Kenelm Digby, and Du Perron, and, more recently, that Wickleman, Werner, and Genz, and Schlegel and Schelling should have renounced such masters and "fled," as they thought, "from petty tyrants to the throne."

We pity, rather than blame, many of those that are stigmatized as "infidels," because they examined prevailing dogmas with freedom and reason. And most noteworthy it is, that the points to which they have generally excepted, constitute no part of genuine Christianity. The philosophic Julian, the virtuous Shaftesbury, never saw her fair face without a mask. Christianity, in its essence, is verily as old as the creation! The truth, against which nothing shall prevail, has been from eternity, and its aspect has only varied to meet the changing condition of man. Christianity "*is not mysterious*," in the sense of being unintelligible, (Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 11; Luke viii. 10; Rom. xi. 25; xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7; viii. 10, xiii. 2; xv. 51; Eph. i. 9; iii. 8–10; Col. i. 25–8,) and we are required to believe no proposition which conveys no meaning. (Isa. i. 18; Ez. xviii. 25.) The bold manœuvre of Hume could not have occasioned such consternation in the Christian camp, had it not been pitched on a false position. Miracles are not *violations* of the laws of nature. They

are the effects of laws unknown to the observers. They alone never did,* never can, afford permanent conviction of any truth. None but the carnal require to have their attention thus drawn to what should be sufficiently attractive in its own nature. (Mark viii. 12; John iv. 48; xx. 29; 1 Cor. i. 22; John vii. 17; Matt. xxiv. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 9.) "What a divine religion might be found out, if charity were really made the principle of it, instead of faith," said the truth-loving Shelley, all unknowing that what he sought was extant and near at hand. And every one who knows the world, is also aware that thousands are sighing in secret under the pressure of doubt, (which, however, does not affect their morality,) while they conform to the worship around them, lest the example of their defection from received opinions should operate injuriously on those who have less self-control. Had Europe early listened to the warning voice of him who told her of the volcano over which she slept, in consequence of the church's departure from truth and duty: she might have been spared the mountains of treasure and rivers of blood, the wreck of arts, the desolation of her fields, and the blighted and broken hearts, which have made the past age the wonder of history, and that may have been but the opening scene of a mighty drama, which is to have the whole earth for its stage. But alas! it seems fated to be ever thus. Nothing less than a series of earthquakes can break the spell of custom. And, if necessary to purify the atmosphere, we may yet have a hurricane, to which the former was but a breeze.

It is with peculiar propriety, then, that *Americans* are invited to weigh this system in the balance of justice. What have we to do with the political religions of Europe? Why should their ecclesiastical differences be transferred and perpetuated here? It has been said in derision that "a religious controversy never dies;" and some have really supposed that to battle with doubt and uncertainty is our lot while here, or ordained for the trial of our faith! And is our God indeed a God afar off? and will he continue to sleep in the hinder part of the ship, when it is threatened with wreck? The scornful question of Pilate cannot surely be for ever reiterated in vain. Are we to take up our rest with Hobbes, and suppose that truth is something that can be *made* by a government? or with the Romanist, that it can be determined by a *priest*?

If, then, the question is asked, who is Emanuel Swedenborg, that we should turn away from all others and put our trust in him? we must own, that it is natural and reasonable; and we only request that

* See the history of the Jews *passim*.

his claims be not dismissed without examination. His pretensions *are* extraordinary, and the more important if just. He presents himself as *the herald of the Lord's second advent in a new dispensation of doctrinal truth, and the proclaimer of a great consequent change in the state of the world.* In evidence of the first, he offers (what no one else has ever given) a rational, complete and consistent interpretation of the Word of God. Of the second, the nations have already been furnished with a fearful proof in the revolutionary flood which has successively swept over the whole of Christendom. And if the tide has receded for a time, from every quarter of the horizon may be seen the clouds which betoken a second storm, a war of opinions, and on that subject which occupies the centre of every man's mind and modifies his views of all others. Himself alleges that, for this holy office, he was prepared from his youth; and that, as a necessary and crowning qualification, like the Prophets, and Seers, and Apostles of old, his spiritual eyes were opened, and he was admitted, as to his interior man, into the spiritual world, with permission to reveal a portion of what he saw and heard.* (Ex. xxiv. 9-11; Num. xxiv. 3; 1 Sam. ix. 9; 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings vi. 17; Zech. i. 8-18; ii. 1; iv. 23; Ez. xi. 1, 24; viii. 3; iii. 12, 14; Dan. viii. 1, 2; ix. 21; x. 1, 7, 8; Acts viii. 39; x. 11-13; 2 Cor. xii. 1, 5, 7; Rev. i. 10, 12, 13 and passim.) We say not that he was *inspired* in the proper sense of that term, or that his writings are *additions* to Scripture, whose canon has long been complete and "settled in heaven." But we do believe he was *illuminated* from the fountain of all light—with a conscious perception of that source—to understand the true meaning of what was already written. Thus *his* was not a new revelation in the sense of being different from the old, but a revelation anew of what was no longer understood, with additional information for its more perfect comprehension.

The son of a learned Swedish bishop, he was early trained to knowledge and virtue. He sought the former in all its departments, first in his own country, and afterwards by extensive travels throughout Europe. His powers as a natural man were thus enlarged and strengthened by discipline the most vigorous and varied. As a philosopher, he won the regard of his most celebrated contemporaries. In some provinces of natural science he ventured beyond them; leaving his discoveries to be subsequently coolly appropriated or rediscovered by others without acknowledgment. He was even ennobled for his

* To the objection that "Paul did not reveal what he saw and heard in the spiritual world," it has been briefly but sufficiently answered, that Ezekiel, Zechariah, Daniel, Peter and John, did.

virtues and distinguished services to the state. But when called in the maturity of life to higher duties, he left all other pursuits and devoted himself to his exalted function. He was not a Mystic. His taste favouring neither extravagant feelings nor indefinite ideas, he never read their writings; and his mind was alike a *tabula rasa* as to *all* the systematic theology of his time, throughout his early life. His was no revival of Sabellianism, or any other heresy: he exposed the weakness of them all. He aspired not to be the head of a sect. He never persuaded any one to embrace the doctrines he taught; but, having given them to the press, he left them to the divine providence of the Lord, from whom they proceeded, and who, he well knew, would make them "accomplish that which he pleased," and cause them to "prosper in that whereunto he had sent them." Neither was literary fame his object. It was only at the instance of a friend, that his name accompanied his last work. Nor did fear induce concealment. He boldly fronted the danger, when his person was threatened with violence or exile, and his writings with suppression. To crown the whole, when, on his dying bed, and conjured by his friend to speak with candour, he avouched, as in the presence of heaven, the truth of all he had written.

To those who profess to give his *doctrines* a fair hearing, yet feel a repugnance to his supernatural pretensions, we can say, that nearly the whole of his present disciples can sympathize with them, for it was in spite of the latter that they yielded their faith to the former. It was not till they had sought a good reason why they should not receive them, that they found none, but much internal evidence instead—both of their truth and value. We know too well the spirit of this Sadduceean age, not to appreciate such an obstacle. And yet none who receive the Scripture can deny the possibility of such communications—besides that, during life, he gave proof of such knowledge on other subjects, satisfactory to judicious persons previously incredulous. To such as concede this possibility, and have not closed their minds against evidence, we present the argument in a nutshell.

Our Lord, before his ascension, announced a judgment to come. We need not state with what accompaniments Christians have anticipated this scene. If, then, the *material* body rise not again; if the material earth be never destroyed; (and we invite their attention to the proof of both;) where can this judgment take place but in that world to which the spirits of men are hastening? If there, could it be visible to the natural eyes of men? If not, *may it not have been already accomplished?* For aught they can tell, it may be so. And if so, of course it must be important that men on earth be apprised of

it; or else it would not have been predicted. How could the information be imparted, except by a voice from heaven; or by some credible individual, who was permitted to witness it? If, then, from the changed and changing state of the world, we believe this last to have been the case: are not objectors bound to show that his testimony on this and other allied topics has internal evidence of falsehood, and no analogy to what we already know to be true? Swedenborg was a philosopher; it is not probable that he was self-deceived. Swedenborg was of independent fortune; he had no vulgar motive to deceive. He was, moreover, a gentleman; he would not, if he could. He was of sincere and simple manners; he could not, if he would. Nay, he well knew, that, for a time, his name would be cast out as evil; and yet he shrunk not from his high mission. He did not, like Anthony or Bernard, macerate himself with penance until reason was driven from her throne. And if imagination—that universal solvent of such difficulties—is to account for all the phenomena in his case: we must still say that she has wrought greater marvels in him, than in any other man known to history. Every lawyer knows that it is the most difficult of feats to frame the briefest circumstantial narrative, which shall be at once fabulous and consistent; and shall he be called impostor or insane in whose thirty volumes, published through twenty-seven years, no scrutiny has ever discovered a contradiction? and that too, when he never speaks conjecturally, or with doubt, but announces his views with all positive directness? We can conjecture the bearing of his friend of forty years,—the Swedish Prime Minister, Count Hopken,—towards such as would inquire of him concerning “the amiable enthusiast!” as he would ask in turn: “What sort of specimen of that tame monster they expected to find in this man of prodigious learning and science,—of which he was yet the master and not the slave,—whose unsullied honour, whose knowledge of mankind and affairs, and varied experience in life, had made him the companion of sages, of princes and nobles, of statesmen and heroes; and whose memory was honoured with exalted eulogy, through the representative of the highest scientific body of his country?” And the reproof would probably fall powerless on such hearers, who, forgetting that a fair tablet is better for inscription than a blotted sheet, would still be incredulous, that the man who was called to illuminate all the dark places of theology, should have been trained in such a school.

Here, then, we might rest our case; but there is another aspect in which it should be viewed. This faith has nothing to fear from the

progress of knowledge in any of its branches. The advance of science never can expel the Deity from his own universe, while we believe that "preservation is continual creation." Discoveries in geology have no terrors for us. We do not believe that the world was made out of *nothing*, or in six natural days; nor are we puzzled to account for a literal flood over the highest mountains; or the impossibilities of a literal ark. Modern views of astronomy—with which all the eloquence of Chalmers cannot reconcile modern views of the atonement—are but part and parcel of our faith. Seeing no reason why Jehovah, if he took flesh at all, should not assume it here, we offer them good and abundant reasons why he should; as also why the Word, which, in its letter, was written on this earth, in its spirit may be useful to men of all worlds of which he is Lord. The nascent sciences of phrenology and mesmerism, should they ever be established, could find a place in this catholic system. For though it is not known, as has been sometimes said, that Swedenborg discovered the leading principle of the former, there is nothing in it to contradict his views; and the higher phenomena of the latter, while they are readily explained by his philosophy, in turn throw a light on the supposed mysteries of his own case. In truth it is here alone that we can find—what we seek in vain elsewhere—clear views of the nature and operation of mind, a perfect system of philosophy combined with a perfect system of religion—though the former is yet to be popularized and illustrated to the common apprehension. Hence also shall the laws of nature be ultimately traced to their source in the power and providence of Deity. Here, too, at last may we hope to find a standard of taste; just and comprehensive canons of criticism in the arts; and, in coming ages, a new literature expository of the whole; and much of the old defecated, and presented with a new aspect and meaning.

It may serve to suspend the force of prejudice, so far at least as to induce inquiry, if the reader is informed that, for many of our views deemed most singular or obnoxious, we have the sanction of precedent or authority in other and respectable quarters. We say nothing of the fact that many texts of Scripture heretofore cited to confirm favourite tenets have been separately surrendered as irrelevant by candid critics. Some bolder spirits, in different communions, have dared to wander from their standard on one point of doctrine and another, without being hunted for heresy, where they were regarded as substantially loyal. Others again have renounced so many of their public tenets, or adopted so many new ones, as to leave the

remainder without consistency. It may not be aside from our purpose to glean up a few of these testimonies, both from individuals and classes of men.

The Unitarian refuses to acknowledge more than one God, or to deny his goodness; and so far we must own he is right, while we regret that he persists in worshipping an abstraction. The ancient philosophers universally taught that "from nothing nothing could come," and they generally, as well as several moderns, believed in the perpetuity of the earth. There is a striking similarity between the hypothesis of Buffon and Laplace, that "the planets proceeded from the sun," and the previous statements of Swedenborg. The modern school of geology has disturbed the literal interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. Sir William Jones has conceded that the first *eleven* chapters may be allowed figurative without injury, and perhaps with advantage to the literal truth of the other narrative parts of Scripture. Many have said the same of the first three. Antiquarian researches in China and India—among the ruins of Egypt and of Central and Southern America, have led many to doubt the estimate of literal chronologers as to the age of society. Dr. Pye Smith has recently revolted against the current notions of the flood. Several oriental systems; Platonists of all times, particularly of the Alexandrian School; Philo; certain Mystics, (so called,) Fenelon among them, recognise the doctrine of a spiritual sun, within which the Divinity dwells, and the emanation thence of all things. What else means that most brilliant thought of all antiquity—"Truth is the body of God, and light is his shadow?" That the Deity is in human form, was a part of *every* ancient faith, until corrupted by the Greek philosophy,—of all Mythology—of Tertullian, and perhaps other fathers of the church. That the soul was in the same form, was set forth by the same authorities—by Macarius and other fathers—more recently by Shakspeare, Spenser, Young, and Schlegel. That angels and demons were once men, was the belief of Pythagoras, some of the latter Platonists, of Clement of Rome, and Origen. We know not how many have taught the existence of guardian and tempting spirits. Scaliger and Semler have both exposed the misinterpretation of the reference in Jude (6) to the Apocryphal book of Enoch. Grotius and Heber have recognised "the Devil," of Scripture as a collective term for the infernal powers in the aggregate; and Chalmers, Hurd, and Harris, (Mammon,) have spoken of our Lord's combat with them while in the flesh as a principal means of redemption. That the Scriptures contained a spiritual sense, was the well-nigh universal opinion before

the Reformation, and of multitudes since;* though they have not always agreed as to what it was. Not poets alone, but the finer spirits in every age, have perceived a *correspondence* between natural and spiritual things. The general repugnance of mankind to the Jews as a people concurs with this system in pronouncing them the vilest of nations. Nor are we careful to defend against the infidel the atrocious acts public and private of certain characters in the Old Testament, which were permitted for their representative import. The repeated controversies on the trinity among the orthodox themselves, leading to various conclusions, indicate a want of clear conceptions on that fundamental point. Some who have examined the collections of Bull, Whiston, and Burton from the Ante-Nicene Fathers, know that many of their testimonies will bear an interpretation favourable to this doctrine. Who has not read the heart-rending prayer of Dr. Watts, in which he gave vent to the agonies occasioned by the common dogmas on this subject; and that he ultimately reached a view very similar to our own? The late Edward Irving, in the zenith of his fame and before his unhappy fall, taught the true doctrine of our Lord's human nature. Schwenkfeld asserted the Omnipresence of his risen body. Adam Clark denied the eternal sonship of Christ, (as also does a distinguished theological professor of our own country,) and admitted Granville Sharp's rule of the Greek article, though inconsistent with other portions of his creed. "The Discipline of the Secret," as we believe, was neither the acknowledgment of the transubstantiation, nor the offering the Apostles' Creed as a password among Christians, but rather *the true doctrine of the Lord*, held by the Gnostic or perfect Christian, and which the catechumens and others less advanced, were not prepared to receive. Sir Thomas Browne, Jeremy Taylor, Locke, Conyers Middleton, Coleridge, Brougham—all deny that miracles are the best proofs of a divine mission.

There are those who will boldly pronounce that no one can be a Christian who denies a vicarious atonement. When such shall have digested Isa. lxiii. 16, and Rom. xiv. 4, and have reflected whether the parable of the prodigal proves their Maker to be altogether such an one as themselves: they may be prepared to hear, that Mr. Isaac Taylor has recently told us that the works of the Fathers before Augustin exhibit few traces of the doctrine; that William Law, Coleridge, Hartley, Irving and many others in England—innumerable ones in

* See Noble's Plenary Inspiration of Scripture.

Germany—Drs. Bellamy and Murdock, Bishop Onderdonk, and several orthodox periodicals in this country—all reject the ordinary scholastic statement. “Justification by faith alone,” is discarded by the new Oxford School; as is also “imputed righteousness,” &c. by many New England divines, who still adhere to its kindred fallacies. The more sober and rational theologians are every where beginning to teach, though in other terms, that regeneration is gradual, during man’s co-operation. Sir J. Mackintosh declares conscience itself to be of gradual formation. Jeremy Taylor, the invalidity of a death-bed repentance. Locke, Dr. Thomas Burnet and Sir H. Davy denied the resurrection of the material body, and Taylor, in his “Physical Theory,” has virtually done the same, by stripping the risen body of all the properties of matter. Nearly all the Fathers believed in a separate place for departed souls before the last judgment; and many writers have since seen the necessity of such an intermediate state, other than purgatory. A sensible change has been wrought in the opinions of the more intelligent as to the nature and causes of the joys of heaven and the pains of hell. It is not mere rhodomontade to say that “Vice is its own punishment, while virtue is its own exceeding great reward;” and that neither retribution is arbitrary. Such was the doctrine of the Stoics and Platonists, and of many subsequent moralists, as Shaftesbury and Cumberland. It is the basis of the phrenological philosophy and of the Universalist’s religion, though, in this last, carried to a suicidal extent. Isaac Taylor has recently—as had several less popular authors before him—exposed the vulgar error, that *primitive* Christianity offered the highest attainable model of purity or intelligence. Bishops Taylor and Watson agree that the apostles themselves were mistaken as to our Lord’s second coming; and they and others dismiss with little ceremony the current notions of a Millennium and his personal reign. Hammond and Stanley Faber tell us that the “New Jerusalem” denotes an improved state of the church on earth. John Robinson, the founder of the New England churches, believed that “more light was yet to break out of God’s Word,” as also did Dr. Watts. And, to say nothing of several popular French writers, Thomas Carlyle has written on this point, as though he barely re-echoed the sentiment of the New Church.* Analogous to the important doctrine of “degrees,” is the common, though mutilated idea of a “scale of beings.” The same is dimly shadowed forth in the philosophy of Plato—as also of the Rosicrucians; and the recent favourable reception of such a work as “Za-

* See Sartor Resartus.

noni," would seem to indicate, in the public mind, a preparation for better things. Des Cartes' Occasional Causes, Malebranche's "Seeing all things in God," Hume's denial of material causation, are all approximations to the truth; as are many things in the philosophical collections of Cudworth and Stanley. There is much also in transcendentalism—as exhibited in the writings of Kant and Schelling, of Cousin, of Coleridge and Carlyle—which we can readily approve as we understand them. We instance their ideas of time and space, of freedom, of reason, or the spiritual, as a higher power than the sensual understanding, or natural mind. The last writer disclaims all knowledge of the works of Swedenborg; but his masters, we know, had read them to some extent. Coleridge knew something of them directly, and much at second hand. The apologies of the church offer many more such coincidences—though Swedenborg himself rarely or never quotes from others, except statements of the doctrine he designs to refute. But enough. Fragments of truth have been dispersed with every wind, and drifted to every shore; here only do we see them embodied in their original and beautiful symmetry. Particles of the precious ore are widely diffused; but where else is that spiritual mercury which shall purge and collect it from the heaps of dross in which it is buried. Since the outburst of infidelity, in the last age, there has been more than a partial return to a sense of religion. Though much indifference still prevails, it is chiefly among those to whom, in any form, it would prove an irksome restraint; or with another class who will not be trammelled with the peculiarities of the authorized creeds. For those, the clergy do battle manfully, even while the walls are crumbling around, but do not find the laity, in all cases, coming so promptly to their aid as in time past. There is, in truth, a very general disposition to waive them, and seek others, in which they may agree. And the wise observer of the signs of the times, who is at the same time acquainted with this faith, may perceive much in the tone of ordinary conversation that partakes of it; and, that our whole current literature forms one grand revolt against those offensive peculiarities, and exhibits much that is german to the teachings of this rational and catholic system.

And why is this not more generally seen? It is because there is not in all literature a question on which, with a few honourable exceptions, unlawful arts of controversy have been so uniformly employed. The policy of silence has been sometimes observed by those who affected a contempt they did not feel. Where this was broken, men who would fain be thought just, not content with the whole quiver

of sophistry, have resorted to *poisoned* weapons. In proof of this we might refer the reader to almost any one of the assaults, or to such passages as are met with in the apologies of the church.* It becomes not any class of Christians, to speak of themselves. But they may offer the testimony of a decided though liberal opponent as to the effect of their doctrine on the holders.

“Whether it be owing to the direct influences of their faith, or to the operation of prudential motives, or to the fact that this religion is not adapted to attract any but spiritually minded men, certain it is, that the disciples of the New Church, as a body, have generally exhibited a more consistent holiness in their lives and conversation than any other sect with which we are acquainted, and this notwithstanding a laxity on one point† of their moral code, which might seem to authorize an occasional deviation from the strict line of rectitude. And not only so, but this church is also marked by an onward tendency, a progressive spirit, too often wanting in sects of higher pretensions. The propulsive elements of Christianity—liberty, charity, and truth are largely mixed up with their system. They are not a sect who suppose that religion is got by spasms, or that Christ is

* It would really seem to have been a part of a regular system of tactics, to credit every idle tale brought against Newchurchmen, and to repeat without shame misstatements often refuted. We instance the fact that to this day the followers of John Wesley continue to reprint his libel on the character and works of Swedenborg, though the personal charges were disproved at the time, in part by his own witnesses; and the semblance of argument arising from mutilated quotations, promptly refuted. We pretend not to say whether he was wholly imposed on by others, or in part by his own credulity and prejudice.

† From this it would appear that a writer, otherwise commendable for his spirit, has permitted himself to be affected by a calumny as contemptible as it has been industriously spread. We will not stain the pages of this work with the details. The primitive Christians had to endure worse. We will barely say that Swedenborg has asserted *gradations* in the vice of impurity, from the casual commerce necessarily tolerated by law to the damnable sin of adultery; and has, *therefore*, been charged with a relaxation of morals! We have a short answer: *It is not true*. No comprehensive moralist, any more than the physician, can altogether omit such topics. The Bible itself has not. All are not required to know them, though every father of a family should. Our author has neither made distinctions without a difference, nor confounded things essentially diverse. There is a sin not unto death; and while the least will injure, some will wound past recovery. He has but recognised the justice of distinctions long known to the civil law and public conscience of Christendom. Had the charge been true, the effects of such principles could not have been concealed, but would have been manifested in a body of Christians known to the world for more than half a century. Many have asserted, none have done half so much as he, to explain the sanctity of the marriage tie; none have so clearly shown the hideous effects of the opposite vices. No Christian can tolerate such things in himself. The differences were stated for the benefit of merely natural men, in their efforts to reform. But enough, and more than we intended.

formed within by one convulsive effort of the soul. Their religion is not one which stops short of any given standard; it is of that kind which maketh wiser and better every day. They are pre-eminently an improving race." (CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, NOV. 1833.)

This is doubtless more than justice, if predicated of all their professors; but that such is their tendency, if permitted to have their legitimate influence, we cannot doubt. Are we not then justified in hoping that the ideal of a true, well-balanced Christian may be again restored and carried to even higher perfection than has yet been realized? And yet this is a liberal doctrine. It does not damn for mere error of the head. It arms against a thousand panic fears; promotes a spirit of cheerful piety; fixes and simplifies the objects of the affections; while it encourages an intelligent activity in all useful channels. In this it accords with the spirit of the age, which protests against gloomy dogmas and demands a show of reason for its faith. Under this system, priestly domination never can attain a dangerous ascendancy. And though that function will ever be required in the church, its holders can aspire to nothing more than to become helpers of our faith and examples to the flock. And chiefly because such knowledge is no longer too high for laymen, who may seek and find it without stint, and readily attain enough to check any such spirit in its birth.

He then who proves his to be the "religion of good sense," should not be met as an Ishmaelite, whose hand is against every man; but rather as a guide through a tangled forest, or the peace-maker, who shows a common ground, on which friends long at variance can meet. Is the Bible so very plain without a doctrine to direct the reader? Why then do not all earnest seekers find the same way? To us there seems a peculiar propriety in one man's being empowered to expound what many wrote. Prophets, evangelists, and apostles, appeared at intervals. Their several messages, all unknown to themselves, constitute one Word of God. For ages it stood an enigma, which resisted every effort of self-derived intelligence to elicit its meaning. Were it not better, then, that one heaven-taught scribe should show the harmony of the several parts and their concurrence to one great end? And those, who refuse to acknowledge his credentials as an authorized ambassador, have to account for the phenomena of an impregnable system of theology, rising up *totus teres atque rotundus* under the hands of a man until then devoted to other pursuits.

But why, we farther ask, should any object to our worshipping the Lord? Though we have a surer method of proving the Scriptures

to be his word, we reject not the grammarian's or critic's art. And we see nothing on the face of the New Testament record of the sayings and acts of Jesus, unworthy of Divinity itself. We think it no degradation to **THE SUPREME** to assume a temporary disguise, if by so doing he could save a world which was fast sinking into night, as a perpetual seminary of heaven; and by the same means render the loss of any other for ever impossible. Here, then, is the true "end of controversy;" for here every legitimate question is fully and fairly answered. How much logic does it require to lead the orthodox, who protest that they believe in but one God, yet assert the divinity of Christ, to the conclusion that he must be that God? And will not the Unitarian in time review his opinions, and consider of a doctrine which, while it avoids the errors which he has rejected, leaves the divinity of the Saviour consistent with the unity of the Deity? Thus it may be seen that the fundamental principles of our system are very plain, and yet meet the wants of the heart. And though its higher truths will task the strongest intellect: we assure such a one that in his long progress he need have nothing to unlearn; but, in added knowledge or diversified application, will find ever new delight.

For the literary, scientific, and official career of Swedenborg, and for the titles of his earlier publications, we would refer the reader to any accessible biography. It is sufficient to observe here, that, with the exception of a small volume of poems and a classical dissertation, they relate chiefly to subjects of pure or mixed mathematics, or certain branches of physics. For twenty years before his attention was exclusively given to sacred studies, his speculations dwelt chiefly on the higher philosophy of nature and of man. The works, which, during this interval, he gave to the world—save two extensive treatises on subjects connected with his department of Assessor of the Royal Board of Mines—all partook of that character, and won for him a European reputation among the scientific of his day. They are severally entitled, "Philosophy reasoning concerning the Infinite," "The Principles of Natural Things," "The Animal Kingdom," and "Economy of the Animal Kingdom;" the last including a dissertation on Psychology. Being written in Latin, they have ever since been favourably known to a learned few; but having been translated, are about to be presented in an English dress to the public, who will thus be enabled to judge whether those judicious or partial friends are to be credited, who say they neither are, nor are likely to be superseded by any thing since written on the same subject.

His very remarkable book, "The Worship and Love of God," may

be regarded as the transition stage between his philosophical and theological writings,—as partaking of the nature of both,—though it is not very clearly characterized by its title. Not an especial exhortation to a life of piety and prayer, it is rather an eloquent descant on the creation of the world, and the original state of man; and wants nothing but measure to constitute it a poem of the highest order of excellence—its charms being the more abiding, in that its substance is truth.

Himself always regarded his whole previous course and mental discipline as an unconscious preparation for the important spiritual function which occupied the last twenty-nine years of his life—from 1743 to 1772. We mean the writing and publishing the series of works which unfold the truths of the new dispensation. These may be conveniently thrown into four classes—Doctrinal, Sacred Metaphysics or Divine Philosophy, Expository, and lastly, treating of the nature and laws of the spiritual world and the state of man after death. Besides these there are also certain posthumous publications of each kind. Of the first class, the small tract, entitled “The New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine,” gives a view in miniature of the entire system. Certain leading heads of doctrine were afterwards expanded into separate treatises, as “Concerning the Lord,” “The Sacred Scriptures,” “Faith,” “Life,” “Charity,” &c. “The True Christian Religion,” containing a complete body of theology, as contrasted with those of both Catholics and Protestants, was the last he published, it having been preceded by a “Brief Exposition” of the doctrine, and followed by a “Coronis, or Appendix.” To the second class may be referred “The Divine Love and Wisdom,” “Divine Providence,” “Influx, or the Nature of the Intercourse between Soul and Body,” and the treatise on “Conjugal Love.” The third and far the largest portion of his works, embracing about two thirds of the whole, comprise “Arcana Cœlestia,” (an exposition of the internal sense of Genesis and Exodus,) “Apocalypse Revealed,” and “Apocalypse Explained”—the last a posthumous publication, though prepared by himself for the press. Another tract gives briefly “The Internal Sense of the Prophets and Psalms:” and there has been recently published from his MSS. an exposition of the remaining historical books of the Word according to the same principles. Besides these there is a small tract entitled, “The White Horse.” The first and third of those named above, incidentally explain a large portion of Scripture besides that of which they expressly treat. And the writings entire contain the meaning of the whole. It is very commonly supposed that most of his books are such as would properly come under the

fourth class; though, in truth, they make scarce a tenth of the series. The distinct treatises are on "Heaven and Hell," "The Last Judgment," which, he says, took place in 1757, and "The Earths in the Universe." Many things of the same kind are interspersed through his other works, as also through his *Spiritual Diary*, now in the course of publication for the first time.

All the theological works put forth by Swedenborg himself (two or three excepted) were first translated into English by the Rev. John Clowes, of the Church of England, and, for sixty-two years, rector of St. John's, Manchester; a man, who, with distinguished talents and learning, is believed, from the concurring testimony of all who knew him, to have made as great progress in the divine life as any of his age. He embraced these principles after his ordination; and was of that class of Newchurchmen who, without suppressing his sentiments, or preaching or praying in violation of them, did not think it necessary to abandon his former connexions, unless required to do so by his ecclesiastical superiors. And the subject was brought to the notice of his Bishop, (the late Dr. Porteus,) who, in full conference with him, declined either to remove or censure him. Rare and most honourable example of spiritual integrity on the one side, and liberality on the other! The *Apocalypse Explained* was translated by the Rev. William Hill, hereinafter mentioned. The complete series have received a French version, a German in part, though all are not published in either language. We learn that they are in course of being rendered in Spanish. The Latin style of Swedenborg, which, in his other works, is always classical, sometimes ambitious, is here only remarkable for its didactic simplicity, clearness, and precision, except in portions, where the nature of the subject compels him to adopt a higher strain.

It is known that there are disciples of Swedenborg in Russia, Sweden, several of the German States; in France, Great Britain, and some of her colonies; in the United States; in several of the West India Isles; and at one or two points in South America. In the first three countries, they continue, in the absence of religious toleration, attached to their national churches. In France and England, there are two classes: those who remain thus undistinguished, and those who have separated. Their numbers, except in the last case, are difficult to be ascertained, though thought to be greater than the public generally are aware of. From hence it would appear that this doctrine has not made very rapid progress in the world. While its adherents admit the fact, it does not shake their faith in the truth of the system. As much might have been anticipated from the

tardy reception which awaited innovations in other branches of knowledge, though both true and important. We were also taught by our author that, for a time, but few would believe his report; that the church in its infant state, would remain, as it were, in the wilderness: and encounter peculiar oppositions from the Protestantism which prevails. Other churches, we know, were for a long season maturing, before they took the place of their predecessors, which did not recede until they had ceased to answer the purposes of such an institution. And in an enlarged view of the history of one which is to endure for ever, a few centuries even of infancy dwindle to a point. The wonder rather is, that it has not been whelmed beneath the tide of obloquy, and every species of persecution short of actual violence, which it has met from surrounding communions; or that it should have grown to its present size under such disadvantages. This church has had neither wealth, nor rank, nor power, nor patronage, nor the *prestige* of popularity on its side. And *against* all these it has declined to use some of the ordinary means of propagation—it being a cardinal maxim with its teachers “always to respect the freedom of others,” and not to press on them truths which they were not prepared to receive, and of which such had better remain in ignorance, lest they should profane them. In the state of the world since this doctrine was first given to it, it was not to be expected that principles so new and so repugnant to its most cherished opinions would readily receive its serious attention. It is not probable that those who are benetted round with the accumulated sophistries of fifteen centuries, will as yet break their bands—or until further collision among the fragments of the old Christian church shall have still more proved to their members the weakness and uncertainty of their respective tenets, and force them to seek a safe refuge. Had Swedenborg claimed his doctrine as his own, or had its moral requirements been more compromising, the case might have been different. As it is, nothing but its intrinsic excellence, sustained, as we believe, by the especial care of Divine Providence, and, as a secondary cause, the countenance of honourable and virtuous men of the world, could have enabled it to survive such repeated and combined assaults. It may be sufficient, if the truth can be simply preserved, to be called into requisition at a more favourable juncture.

The New Church first received a separate form in 1783, from a few men of ability and strong purpose in England, who, weary of all other teaching, and having seen its truths in their own light, and regarding them as *the last hope of the world*, desired to impart to others what had afforded such perfect satisfaction to themselves. And thus

far their labour has not been altogether in vain. It has been propagated by individual effort in conversation and correspondence; by preaching, both regular and missionary; by courses of lectures; by circulating the works of Swedenborg, periodicals, tracts and larger books in their illustration. It is not deemed lawful to resort to declamation or persuasion. But the truth is stated plainly—sometimes in contrast with common errors—and left to produce its own effect on the mind of the hearer. As a general rule, controversy is shunned; discussion never; and when, as has often happened, she has been compelled to put on her armour, it has been most frequently in defence. And those who wish to know whether she has been able to repel the attacks of Romanists, Unitarians, Calvinists, and Churchmen; and give a reason for her faith; are confidently referred to “Clowes’s Letters to a Member of Parliament,” to “Hindmarsh’s Letters to Priestley,” to “Noble’s Appeal,” or “Plenary Inspiration,” and to “Clissold’s Letter to Archbishop Whateley.” Whatever else the reader might find in these works, in none of them would he be offended with the grossness or asperity which too frequently characterize such productions. We doubt not, instead, that he would be struck with the spirit of Christian gentleness and candour, which animates strength of argument, adorned with the graces of eloquence or of a vigorous and classical style. Besides the above, there has all along been waged a straggling war of pamphlets, in which charges have been regularly met, whenever a respectable name stood sponsor to their truth. And we are perfectly willing, that the success of our cause should be perilled on the extant labours of her champions. In two instances, she has departed from her usual line of policy, and carried the war into hostile territory, without however losing sight of justice or good temper. And we cannot think that any intelligent reader could arise from a fair perusal of Mason’s “Job Abbott,” or Clissold’s “End of the Church,” and say that the existing Christian parties have *nothing more* to do in defence of their several systems.

The first person who introduced the doctrines of the New Church into the United States, was a Mr. Glen—not perhaps the most suitable individual for such a mission—who delivered lectures on the subject in Philadelphia, and a few other places, in the year 1784. His efforts seem to have met with but partial success; though some, who first received them from him, subsequently imparted them to others. A more prudent, and in all respects better qualified advocate was the Rev. William Hill, an English clergyman, who visited this country at two different periods from 1794 to 1804. He

preached with acceptance in many towns of Massachusetts, and in some of the Atlantic cities; and, both by his character and address, aided in drawing the attention of others to the subject which lay nearest his own heart. The first American minister was ordained in 1798, since when, the number of those who favour these views, chiefly gathered out of other denominations, has gradually increased to something more than 5000: not a very strong proof that they are suited to the taste of the credulous or enthusiastic. In nearly every instance their reception is supposed to have been the result of comparative examination and against predilection. There are now societies in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cincinnati, and some minor towns in the eastern, western, and southern portions of the Union, to the number of forty-two, besides isolated individuals, or small numbers, in more than two hundred different places. When Washington, on his retirement from office, returned a civil answer to a congratulatory address of his fellow-citizens of the New Jerusalem, it was probably thought a great stretch of condescension; and perhaps an equal exertion of good nature, when, at the instance of a legal friend, Robert Morris and Benjamin Franklin subscribed for the chief doctrinal work of Swedenborg. When, however, in process of time, it was whispered that more than one member of royal and noble houses of Europe, and several individuals high in civil and military employment, were supposed to have secretly admired these views; when it was farther told, that, at one period, fifty ministers of the established Church of England, and many in different parts of the continent, were inoculated with the same; as also that certain philosophers and literati, who had heard of the "*cor inscrutabile* in a politic head," knew more of them than they were willing to avow: it was kindly supposed to be "not quite so clear a case that there was nothing in it."

Its ecclesiastical polity, at first very general and simple, has been successively enlarged and improved with the growth of the church, until the body is now perhaps as well organized as could be expected, while its members are so few and dispersed. The clergy—at present about thirty in number—are divided into the three orders of ministers, pastors, and ordaining ministers. The second, in addition to the duties of the first, performs others usually indicated by his title, and also administers the holy supper. The peculiar duty of the third is to institute societies, ordain other ministers, and preside at the meetings of the representative bodies of the church. Within a small district this is called an association. Within a larger—a convention. The corresponding body in England is termed a con-

ference. The clergy sit in the same body with lay-delegates from societies, or individuals, but matters purely ecclesiastical are referred to them alone. The ordaining ministers are not confined to a particular district in the exercise of their functions, nor is the priesthood regarded as indelible; as some who once officiated have resigned without other disqualification. A numerous clergy, though desirable, where they can be sustained in the discharge of their duty, is not so indispensable to the spread or confirmation of a doctrine so intelligible, and which, we think, commends itself to the sincere and diligent seeker of truth. And now that the press is more efficient and more used, it may be made to perform, and perhaps better, much of their otherwise appropriate duty. For twenty years or more, the church was annually represented in one convention. In a territory so extended, this was found inconvenient to those at a distance, and there are now three such bodies, the Eastern, (which was the General,) the Middle, and Western, based on principles somewhat modified by the state of the church. The first is a representation of societies. The other two are associations both of societies and individuals for the promotion of general objects, without however disturbing the gradation of the ministry.

It ought, however, to be stated, that the ecclesiastical order above mentioned, is especially that of the Eastern or General Convention—the other two conventions, which are in fact general also, without the name, not having as yet definitely settled the whole of their ecclesiastical order. It is hoped that in time there will be a body, meeting less frequently, delegated from the different territorial divisions of the Union.

Most of the societies, both in Europe and this country, use a form of worship, public and private. That first used in England, was a modification of the National Church service. They have now, after several changes, one that better expresses their doctrinal views. The present American service is simple, and consists entirely of selections from Scripture, with chants and glorifications; but the New Church is not confined to any external form or ritual whatever. Its doctrines admit of every variety in this respect, and inculcate only that unity which is produced by charity. Hence, almost every form has prevailed in this country, and even now, some societies use hymns and parts of the English Liturgy in their worship. The New Jerusalem "Te Deum," as contained in a former American Liturgy, though not appearing in the later liturgies, is perhaps the sublimest of invocations.

Communication with the church in England has been regularly kept up, and through this, with the Continent—of late more directly. The books heretofore used by us have been chiefly of British product, and many of these are still used by those who prefer the English to the American translations. Next to those already mentioned, the best known are those of Mr. Clowes, who, besides his translations during his long life, published many volumes of sermons, and other works, chiefly expository, all characterized by the unction and other spiritual graces of the man. Though much literary labour, in proportion to the means, has already been performed, incalculably more remains to be done.

The American contributions to our literature, have been chiefly volumes of sermons—as those of Roche, Brown, the Worcesters, De Charms, Barrett's Lectures and Life of Swedenborg, Sampson Reed's "Growth of the Mind," "Kinmont's Lectures on the Natural History of Man."

The London Intellectual Repository, is now in its thirty-first year. The New Church Advocate, is another English periodical of more recent date, which is now vigorously conducted. "La Nouvelle Jerusalem," a very able periodical, now in its sixth year, is published in French, at St. Amand, Cher, France. There is also a German periodical for the New Church, published at Tübingen, Wurtemberg, under the editorship of the highly talented and indefatigable Dr. Tafel, Librarian of the Royal University in that place.

In this country, there is the Boston N. J. Magazine, now in its seventeenth year. In this have appeared many articles and sermons worthy of being embodied in a separate form. Also, the New-churchman, now in its fourth year, besides several others, which appeared for a short time at New York and Cincinnati.

The apologies of Dr. Tafel, of Tübingen, Germany, (who is now engaged in editing the posthumous works of Swedenborg,) as also those of the late M. Edouard Richer, of Nantes, France, exhibit great learning and ability. There are, both here and in England, societies for the circulation of tracts, chiefly doctrinal, in which the object has been to set forth our principles clearly, calmly and strongly in brief space. And perhaps a selection from these would give a stranger a more correct idea of the system than some of the larger works; as all the chief doctrines have thus been explained to popular apprehension. But the most important institution of the church, is the Society for Printing and Publishing the Works of Swedenborg, instituted in Manchester, England, in 1782—and afterwards merged

into a similar one commenced in London in 1810. This was the only source from which the English translations could be procured for a time—though American editions of most of the works may now be had by means of a similar society here. The two together have caused the circulation of very many thousand volumes; and their labours can never be dispensed with.

A word or two, before we conclude, on certain points of *casuistry*, as to which (strangely enough!) we have been misunderstood. Religious freedom is the inalienable right of every man, and for its use he is responsible to God alone. Civil liberty, though the means of the greatest blessings to those who are worthy of it, can only prove a curse to such as are not; and it is not desirable that it should be enlarged hastily or farther than the nations are qualified for its use: though we rejoice that the means of such preparation are increased in number and efficiency, and that the spirit of the age is, to avail itself of them more than in time past. Strictly as the Christian should refrain from avenging his private wrongs, and much as he should desire public peace; till the world is regenerated, the injustice of governments and nations, will give frequent occasions of war. In such cases, it is legitimate to employ means of defence; and we accept the general sentiment “that the only way to avoid it is to be ever prepared for it.” The Newchurchman is taught to shun party spirit, where great principles are not really at stake; to yield obedience to a protecting government, wherever conscience will permit; not hastily to urge changes in organic law; and faithfully to discharge any public duties to which he may be called. In private life we avoid singularity in matters indifferent. We affect none in language, dress, or manners. We have no sumptuary laws: but leave each one to graduate his expenses to the scale of his ability and station in society, and to select his friends and associates among the virtuous and intelligent of every name. We have no respect for affected solemnity, needless austerity, or will-worship of any kind. We do not deem it necessary for Christians of every age to refrain from public amusements and social recreations. The love of self and the world, against which Divine Wisdom has warned us, we take to be something more and other than any of these things. He who will shun the evils forbidden in the decalogue, as sins against God, and cultivate the opposite virtues, will find enough to occupy him without distracting his attention with uncommanded observances. Though, with our views, we cannot but have an abiding sense of the Divine Presence, and of the necessity of regeneration to future happiness: yet the calm and rational delight we take in contemplating religious truths, does not inflame us to enthusiasm in public worship.

We must own, too, that we take little pleasure in frequenting the temples of other Christians, where we are not certain that our prayers are directed to the same object ; where we hear so much that grates on our sense of truth, and so little that accords with the supremacy of Him we worship—though we willingly co-operate with them in the spread of the Bible, the promotion of any point of public morals, or measures of general utility. For a like reason we read but little of the current theology of the day, except as an index of the state of religious opinion. In our conferences with others on religious topics, we prefer to use other language than that of Scripture, (except the plainest,) seeing our apprehensions of its meaning are generally so different. And while we seek the *mollia tempora fandi*, we do not indiscriminately press the matter of religion on the attention of all unbelievers, or at all times. Such of us as have leisure to devote to literary pursuits, or inquiry into truth, always seek to unite therewith some useful occupation. There is a good deal of technical phraseology in the works of our author, which sounds strange to a novice ; but its meaning is easily learnt, and it is used in a steadfast sense. Lastly, we do not look upon death as in itself so terrible an event, and think that no Christian should. Neither do we indulge in passionate grief for our departed friends,—our natural feeling for their loss being generally mitigated by our conceptions of divine truth and mercy, and of the nature of the other life. If any of these “peculiarities” are thought so offensive as to be without precedent or pretence of reason, we must bear the imputation with what grace we may.

In reviewing what we have written, we find we have treated with freedom, but we hope with fairness, the principles of other professed followers of our Lord ; and we are sure without any feelings of hostility to individuals who have held and still hold them—for many of whom we entertain high respect. It is with us a principle to recognise and honour goodness wherever we meet with it ; though we cannot but regret that, in this our age, it is allied so often to and with so much error. And this feeling we are bound to cherish even though it be not reciprocated. From our own position we survey the state of the world, intellectual, political, and religious, and think we see in all those departments marked and strong tendencies towards a better order of things. *Magnus ab integro seculorum nascitur ordo*. And though we live in a period of transition : the anxiety, of which all must partake at such a season, is alleviated in our case by the assurance that He who is at the helm, having eternal and glorious ends in view, orders or permits only such events as can be converted to their promotion. Now that other systems are breaking up around us, we

would most respectfully invite our countrymen to give this a fair consideration, and not to condemn it unheard or from the representations of its enemies alone. Fraud, violence, menace, fashion, the favour of princes, diplomacy, have all tried in vain to reunite Protestants on some one basis ; wrangling polemics and verbal critics have succeeded as little. In our conscience we believe that in this confusion worse confounded, none but the Author of our faith could tell us what it is ; and this we doubt not he has done through a qualified agent. He who receives "The True Christian Religion," as here delineated, cannot but smile at the pretensions of Rome. For her expositions or superintendence he can have no possible use ; and the "brutum fulmen" of her anathema will fall harmless at his feet.

Such is the bread which we have been invited to cast upon the waters. We dismiss it to the care of Providence, and the justice of our readers.

OMISH OR AMISH CHURCH.

BY SHEM ZOOK,

MIFFLIN COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.

OMISH or Amish, is a name which was, in the United States, given to a society of Mennonites, but who are not known by that name in Europe, the place from which they originally came. In many parts of Germany and Switzerland, where they are still considerably numerous, they are there sometimes, for the purpose of distinction, called Hooker Mennonites, on account of their wearing hooks on their clothes; another party of Mennonites being, for similar reasons, termed Button Mennonites. The principal difference between these societies consists in the former being more simple in their dress, and more strict in their discipline. In their religious forms of worship, the different denominations of Mennonites vary but little from other Protestants. They consider the scriptures as the only rule of faith, and maintain that the surest mark of the true church is the sanctity of its members. They have regular ministers and deacons, who are not allowed to receive fixed salaries; in their religious assemblies, however, every one has the privilege to exhort and to expound the scriptures. Baptism is administered to adults only, infants not being considered proper subjects, and is administered by pouring water upon the head of the subject. The Lord's Supper is administered in commemoration of the death of our Saviour. It is considered unlawful to take an oath on any occasion, as well as to repel force by force; and they consider war, in all its shapes, as unchristian and unjust. Charity is with them a religious duty, and none of their members are permitted to become a public charge.

Great injustice has been done the Mennonites by Protestant as well as by Catholic writers, by imputing to them doctrines which they never held with regard to the incarnation of Christ and the Millennium, or personal reign of Christ upon earth. That Menno Simon was charged with entertaining peculiar and unwarranted

opinions respecting these matters is true, (doctrines which we deem improper to mention, but an account of which may be found by referring to article Anabaptists, in the *Encyclopædia Americana*;) but it is well known to all who are acquainted with the writings or works of Menno Simon, that if his written declarations are to be received as an evidence of his opinions, then the said charges are entirely gratuitous and without foundation in fact. The Mennonites have also been charged with having originated with the Anabaptists of Munster; and have frequently been confounded with the followers of Bockhold, John of Leyden, and David Joris. This charge is equally and totally incorrect. It is not denied that many of those who had been misled by these fanatics, ultimately joined the Mennonites; but they were not admitted into their society until they had wholly repudiated the wild and fanatical notions of the Munsterites. The many, and often bitter, controversies which took place during the time of the Reformation, not only between Catholic and Protestant writers, but often between the Protestants themselves, added to the fact that the history of the Mennonites has hitherto been written by writers of other sects, readily account for the misstatements and incorrect accounts respecting the origin, history, and religious opinions of the Mennonites.

The name Amish or Omish was derived from Jacob Amen, a native of Amenthal, in Switzerland, and a rigid Mennonite preacher of the seventeenth century; but that he was not the founder of a sect will be evident from the fact, that the society who are in the United States wrongfully called Amish or Omish, still rigidly adhere to the Confession of Faith which was adopted at Dortrecht, in Holland, A. D. 1632, (before the time of Jacob Amen,) by a General Assembly of ministers of the religious denomination who were at that time and in that place called Mennonites, (after Menno Simon, an eminent preacher and native of Friesland, in Holland,) but who were (as has been well established by writers of the seventeenth century), prior to that time, at different periods, known by the names of Henricians, Petrobrusians, and Waldenses. The number of the milder Mennonites in the United States is computed at 120,000, while that of the rigid Mennonites is not supposed to exceed 5000.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

BY JOHN M. KREBS, D.D.,

PASTOR OF THE RUTGERS STREET CHURCH, NEW YORK, AND PERMANENT CLERK OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

I. DOCTRINE, WORSHIP, AND GOVERNMENT.

THE published "Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," sets forth at large the system of doctrine, mode of worship, and form of government, adopted by this church.

The Doctrines are contained in the "Confession of Faith," and in the "Larger and Shorter Catechisms," and are those which are popularly denominated "Calvinistic." This distinctive title is appropriated to this system, not because *Calvin* invented it, but because, among all the modern advocates of it, he was undoubtedly the most profound and able, and because it has suited the policy of some to endeavour to convey the idea that this system was unknown until Calvin began to propagate and defend it.

In the Confession of Faith there are many doctrines in which the Presbyterians agree with their brethren of other denominations. In regard to all that is embraced in that formula concerning the being and perfections of God, the Trinity of persons in the Godhead, the divinity, incarnation and atoning sacrifice of the Son of God, &c., they may be said to hold substantially in common with all sects who deserve the Christian name. But with respect to the true state of human nature before God, the doctrine of sovereign, unconditional election to eternal life, the doctrine that Christ died in a special sense for his elect people, the doctrine of justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ alone, of sanctification by the special and invincible power of the Holy Spirit, and of the perseverance of the saints in holiness, they differ very materially from many who bear the Christian name. In short, with regard to what are commonly called the "five points" discussed and decided in the Synod of Dort, the Confession is opposed to Arminianism, and coincides with the Calvinistic system maintained by that body.

These evangelical doctrines, as they are taught in the Word of

God, were revived and held with singular unanimity by all the churches which arose out of the Reformation, as appears very evidently from a comparison of the various creeds and confessions which were framed and published by them. Those who on the Continent adhered to Martin Luther in his ritual views and observances, and the Anglican prelatists as well as the Reformed Churches of France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland and Scotland, equally adopted the tenets since denominated Calvinistic, their differences having relation mainly to the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, the parity of the Christian ministry, and their subordinate topics. And the history of the church and of the world, (as a constant developement of this great principle, that truth is in order to goodness, its great touchstone, in its tendency to produce holiness, and that there is an inseparable connexion between faith and practice, truth and duty,) together with the admissions of some of the most eminent scholars and divines, and eloquent writers of later days, even of those who by no means favoured Calvinism, are an irrefragable testimony to the benign influence exerted by this much-abused system, on the illumination and salvation of those who cordially embrace it, and on the moral character and deportment, the knowledge and freedom, and the general prosperity and happiness of every community where it has prevailed.*

* "By many ignorant and prejudiced persons a very foul, but a very false, allegation, both before the time of the Synod of Dort, and also down to the present day, has occasionally been advanced against the Calvinistic system. That system has been set forth as offering a premium for gross immorality, as inculcating in the case of the vainly presumptuous, an unhallowed security, and as advocating, to the certain ruin of the constitutionally despondent, all the wild recklessness of utter and uncontrolled desperation. Hence, in the way of summary, we have been gravely assured that, according to the Calvinistic scheme of interpretation, the elect, no matter what may be the obstinate ungodliness of their lives, must be finally saved even in their impenitence, while the reprobate, no matter what may be the devoted holiness of their conversation, even in their godly penitence must be finally damned. Nothing can be more unfounded than this vulgar allegation.

"Calvinism really teaches, that the elect, even though they may be humbly doubtful of their own individual election, after their effectual calling, however speckled with the remains of human corruption, will always lead holy and devoted and godly lives; while the reprobate, even though they may madly and contemptuously presume upon their own imagined security, will always show their true character, either by an indulgence in habitually unhallowed practice, or by an utter deadness to every sentiment of vitally influential religion."—*Judic. Synod. Dordrech. Conclus. Cap. V.*

"This invariable association of holiness with election, and of unholiness with reprobation, is assuredly the special badge of Calvinism; and for the abuse of the system by the profanely licentious, that scheme is no more responsible, than any other scheme can justly be made responsible for its own particular and disallowed perversion.

"The dogma, if such a dogma be held even by the wildest Antinomian, that an individual fearlessly and securely may sin, because without evidence, or rather against evi-

The forms of worship are simple and scriptural, consisting in praise, prayer, and the reading and preaching of the word of God. They are regulated according to a prescribed "Directory," but are

dence, he has fondly persuaded himself that he is one of the elect—that dogma is a mere perversion of the Genevan system. A pious Calvinist—and among doctrinal Calvinists have been numbered some of the best and the wisest and the most holy men who have ever adorned the Catholic Church—a pious Calvinist would shrink from it with horror and disgust. So far from sanctioning the blasphemous absurdity, on the real principles of his own scheme, he would be the first and the foremost to consider its maintainance, by any pretended Calvinist, as a black mark indicative of the wretched perverter's own reprobation. He would say—Whatever may be the secret purpose of God in regard to effectual calling, no man can claim to be of the number of the elect to glory, unless as a clear evidence of his election, he can show a life devoted to his Saviour and instinct with fruit-producing holiness. As honest men, we are bound, in the measure of our opportunity, faithfully to investigate doctrinal truth; but then, we are equally bound to abstain from the offensive shamelessness of unmerited calumny."—*Faber's Primitive Doctrine of Election*, B. I., chap. vi. sec. 2.

As the most powerful body of European refugees from prelatical cruelty, who originally settled in the United States, were inflexible Calvinists; and as they have impressed their character upon all the national attributes of our republic: it is indispensable accurately to comprehend the cardinal principles of Calvinism in its operation and results, among the entire body of its genuine disciples in this country—the original Anglican Puritans, the Scottish and Irish Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Reformed Dutch and Germans. In addition, therefore, to the previous testimony of Mr. Faber, three separate witnesses are adduced; and as neither of them are Calvinists, the four combined historiographers must be admitted as proof equivalent to moral demonstration.

Calvin.—The author of the biographical notice of "Calvin," in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, among other expressions laudatory of the exalted virtues, noble talents, and transcendent erudition of the French Reformer, thus characterizes him and his most illustrious compeer. Luther and Calvin are "twin stars, the brightest of that constellation of lights by whose effulgence were dispelled the long night of darkness, under the cloud of which the energies of mankind suffered eclipse; and having emerged, they shone forth with a brilliance and glory unparalleled in the history of the world."

The same writer also mentions, among the chief points which distinguish the system of Calvin from that of the other Reformed Churches,—the independence of the church of the civil power, and the spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament "of the Lord's Supper."—*Encyclopædia Britannica*, article CALVIN.

The Puritans.—Mr. Bancroft, in his *History of the United States*, exactly coincides with Mr. Macaulay and other critics, who have illumined the world by their splendid lucubrations in the *Edinburgh Review*. The American narrator's evidence being so unexceptionable, a few sentences are extracted. It must be premised, however, that he uses the terms Calvinism and Puritanism, in the doctrinal view, as identical.

"Puritanism was religion struggling for the people; the shelter, said its enemy, for the noble principle of liberty. It was its office to engraft the new institutions of popular energy upon the old European system of a feudal aristocracy and popular servitude. The good was permanent. The outward emblems were of transient duration. The effects of Puritanism display its true character. Ecclesiastical tyranny is of all kinds the worst. Its fruits are cowardice, idleness, and poverty. Puritanism was a life-giving spirit. Activity, thrift, and intelligence followed in its train."

"The political character of Calvinism, which with one consent, and with instinctive judgment, the monarchs of that day feared as republicanism, and which Charles II.

not minutely controlled by the stereotyped forms of any authorized or commanded liturgy. Not condemning either the principle or the use of a liturgy, the Presbyterian Church, nevertheless, from a conviction that the practice of confining ministers to set or fixed forms of prayer for public worship, derives no warrant from the spirit and examples of the word of God, nor from the practice of the primitive church, and that it is, moreover, unprofitable, burdensome to Christian liberty, and otherwise inexpedient, disapproves of such restriction; but she has, at the same time, made such provision in her "Directory" for the service, that it may be performed with dignity

declared a 'religion unfit for a gentleman,' is expressed in a single word—Predestination. Did a proud aristocracy trace its lineage through generations of a high-born ancestry, the republican Reformer brought down the record of the noblest enfranchisement from 'the book of life.' His converts defied the opposing world; and standing serenely amid the crumbling fabrics of centuries of superstition, they had faith in one another; and the martyrdoms of Cambray, the fires of Smithfield, and the surrender of benefices by two thousand nonconformist Presbyterians, attest their perseverance. Such was the system which for a century and a half assumed the guardianship and liberty for the English world.

"To advance intellectual freedom, Calvinism absolutely denied the 'sacrament' of ordination: thus breaking up the great monopoly of priestcraft, and scattering the ranks of superstition. To restrain absolute monarchy in France, in Scotland, and in England, it allied itself with the decaying feudal aristocracy which it was sure to outlive; to protect itself against the feudal aristocracy it infused itself into the mercantile class and the inferior gentry; and to secure a life in the public mind, in Geneva, and in Scotland, wherever it gained dominion, it invoked intelligence for the people, and in every parish planted the common school.

"Calvinism overthrew priestcraft; Calvinism saw in goodness infinite joy, in evil infinite woe; and recognising no other abiding distinctions, opposed secretly, but surely, hereditary monarchy, aristocracy, and bondage. Massachusetts owned no king but the King of heaven; no aristocracy but of the redeemed; and no bondage but the hopeless, infinite, and eternal bondage of sin. Calvinism invoked intelligence against Satan, the great enemy of the human race; and the farmers and seamen of Massachusetts nourished its college with corn and strings of wampum, and in every village built the free school. Thus had the principle of freedom of mind first asserted for the common people, under a religious form, by Wiclif, been pursued; until at last it reached a perfect developement, coinciding with the highest attainment of European philosophy."—*Bancroft's History of the United States*, vol. i. pp. 279, 289, 290, 460, 469; vol. ii. pp. 459–463.

One more testimony is appended. It is of the highest value; because it is the conclusion of an essay, the design of which is this: expressly to invalidate and disprove the Calvinistic theory of the divine government both in providence and grace.

Practical Tendency of Calvinism.—"From the earliest ages down to our own days, if we consider the character of the ancient Stoics, the Jewish Essenes, the modern Calvinists, and Jansenists; when compared with that of the Epicureans, the Sadducees, Arminians, and the Jesuits; we shall find that they have ever excelled in no small degree in the practice of the most rigid and respectable virtues; and have been the highest honour of their own ages, and the best models for imitation to every age succeeding."—*Encyclopædia Britannica*, article PREDESTINATION.

and propriety, as well as profit, to those who join in it, and that it may not be disgraced by mean, irregular, or extravagant effusions.

The Presbyterian Church, moreover, prescribes no canonical vestments for her ministers; possesses no altar, but only a communion table; and instead of kneeling at the Lord's Supper, the communicants sit; she rejects lay-baptism, and godfathers and godmothers, and the sign of the cross in baptism; and she repudiates all saints' days, and observes the Lord's day as the sabbath and as the only season of holy time commanded to Christians.

In all these matters, it is believed that she is sanctioned by the scriptures, the practice of the primitive church, and the principles of the purest churches of the Reformation; while her own history and experience furnish a confirmation of the value of her practice, which she fears not to compare with that of any other religious community, in its influence, (as well as the influence of her doctrines and discipline,) on the order and decorum of public worship, on the purity in the faith of her ministers, on the edification of the worshippers, and on the sanctification of their hearts and lives.

The plan of government rests on these avowed and cardinal principles:—That God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrine and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. That the rights of private judgment, in all matters that respect religion, are universal and unalienable. That it is not even desirable to see any religious constitution aided by the civil power, farther than may be necessary for protection and security, and at the same time be equal and common to all others. That, in perfect consistency with the above principle of common right, every Christian church or union or association of particular churches, is entitled to declare the terms of admission into its communion, and the qualifications of its ministers and members, as well as the whole system of its internal government which Christ hath appointed. That our blessed Saviour, for the edification of the visible church, hath appointed officers, not only to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments, but also to exercise discipline, for the preservation both of truth and duty, by censuring or casting out the erroneous or scandalous, according to the rules contained in the word of God; that, nevertheless, there are truths and forms with respect to which men of good characters may differ, and in all these it is the duty both of private Christians and societies, to exercise mutual forbearance towards each other. That the character, qualifications, and authority of church officers are laid down in the holy scriptures, as well as the proper method of their

investiture and institution; yet the election of the persons to the exercise of this authority in any particular society is in that society. That all church power, whether exercised by the body in general, or in the way of representation by delegated authority, is only ministerial and declarative; that is, the holy scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners,—no church judicatory having the right to *make* laws to bind the conscience, by virtue of their own authority, but only to judge upon laws already made, and common to all who profess the gospel; and all their decisions should be founded on the revealed will of God; and that ecclesiastical discipline must be purely moral, or spiritual in its object, and not attended with any civil effects; and it can derive no force whatever, but from its own justice, the approbation of an impartial public, and the countenance and blessing of the great Head of the Church universal.

It is farther held by Presbyterians, that Christ has appointed and established in the holy scriptures a certain definite form of government for his Church; that, however many particular churches may be constituted, they are not independent societies, but are connected parts of *one body*; that the actions and operations of the several parts should be in subordination to the whole; that this being an organized body, it is furnished with officers for the purpose of communicating instruction, and for the orderly government of the society; that these offices were expressly instituted by Christ, the only Head of the Church, before he left the world; that some of them were, at first, endowed with extraordinary powers; but the ordinary and permanent officers of the Church—as organized by the apostles, after the model of the Jewish Synagogue, which was undoubtedly Presbyterian,—are pastors or teachers, elders who rule, and deacons who have charge of the alms for the poor; that as to bishops and presbyters, the holy scriptures make no difference between them; these, like other names therein applied to the ministers of the gospel, being applied promiscuously and indifferently to the same officers; that the same *character* and *powers* being also, in the scriptures, ascribed interchangeably to bishops and presbyters, it is plain that they are identical both as to their *order* and their *name*; and therefore all the ministers of the gospel, although described by different names and titles which designate their various functions, are of equal official rank. That the apostles indeed were invested with authority over all the churches and all the other ministers; but as they have no successors in their inspiration and miraculous gifts, by which they were qualified to exercise such a power over their brethren, so they have *no successors in that plenary authority*, which

Christ committed to them; but, since their departure out of the world, all regular pastors and teachers in the Church of Christ are equal in authority, no one being invested with power to rule over his brethren in the ministry, although each is appointed a ruler as well as an instructor over the flock of which he has been regularly constituted a bishop; and the presbyterate being the highest permanent office in the Church, every faithful pastor of a flock is successor to the apostles in every thing in which they were to have any successors, and is scripturally ordained with the "laying on of the hands of the presbytery;" that the difference which, in after ages, sprung up, has no foundation or vestige in the sacred record; that the gradual introduction of prelacy within the first four centuries, was not only practicable, but one of the most natural and probable of all events; how it came to pass, it is not difficult to explain; and the most competent judges and profound inquirers into early history, have pronounced that it actually took place; that all arguments which our Episcopal brethren profess to derive from scripture in favour of their system, are perfectly nugatory, and do not yield it the least solid support; that while the advocates for prelacy, or diocesan episcopacy, have mainly relied on the fathers, the fathers of the first two centuries are so far from furnishing a single passage which gives even a semblance of aid to the episcopal cause, that, like the scriptures, they every where speak a language wholly inconsistent with it, and favourable only to the doctrine of ministerial parity; that the great body of the reformers and other witnesses for the truth, of different ages and nations, with one voice, maintained the same doctrine, as taught in scripture, and in the primitive church; and that even the most conspicuous English Reformers, while they assisted in organizing an episcopal establishment in their own country, defended it on the ground of human expediency and the will of the magistrate, rather than that of divine right; and they acknowledged the foreign churches, which were organized presbyterially, to be true churches of Jesus Christ; that the Church of England, and those churches which have immediately descended from her, stand absolutely alone in the whole Protestant world, in representing bishops as an order of clergy superior to presbyters; all other Protestants, even those who adopt a sort of prelacy, having pronounced it be a mere human invention; that some of the most learned and pious bishops and other divines of the Church of England, have utterly disclaimed the divine right of diocesan episcopacy; and have declared that they considered a great majority of the clergy of that church, in later as well as earlier times, as of the same opinion with themselves; and, that such like

various, abundant, and explicit testimony, not only establishes in the most perfect manner the validity of the Presbyterian ordinations and ministry, but it goes farther, and proves that they are superior to the Episcopal, as being more scriptural, more conformable to primitive usage, and possessing more of that whole character which is fitted to satisfy an humble, simple-hearted, Bible Christian. Therefore, although some zealous advocates for the divine right of diocesan episcopacy charge them with schism, for being out of the communion of their church, and denounce our ministry and ordinances as invalid: Presbyterians may well receive such charges and denunciations with the same calm, unmoved, dispassionate, and conscious superiority, that they feel when a partisan of the Papacy denounces them for rejecting the supremacy of the Pope, and questions the possibility of their salvation out of the Church of Rome.

And as the church is one body: so, for the wise and orderly government of the whole, it is expedient to have a gradation of courts or judicatories, from the authorities which pertain to a particular church, through as many gradations as may have been established, up to the highest judicatory which can be assembled, with convenience, for the decision of all matters, according to the word of God, which may relate to the welfare and increase of the church. And it is accordingly held to be agreeable to the scriptures that the church be governed by congregational, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies.

These are severally composed, both of *ministers*, or those elders whose office it is to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments, as well as to bear rule; and *ruling elders*, whose office has been understood by a great part of the Protestant Reformed Churches, to be designated in the holy scriptures by the title of “governments,” and of those “elders who rule well,” but do not labour in the word and doctrine. Hence is derived the name “Presbyterian,” from the Greek words *πρεσβυτερος* and *πρεσβυτεριον*, which, as they occur in the New Testament, respectively signify an *elder*, and a *body of elders*, or a *presbytery*.

The officers of a particular church, when it is fully organized, are a bishop, or pastor,—or more as the case may be—a bench of ruling elders, and a bench of deacons. The pastor, or pastors, and the ruling elders, compose the church session. To this body is confided the spiritual government of the congregation; for which purpose, they have power to inquire into the knowledge and Christian conduct of the members of the church; to call before them offenders and witnesses; to receive members into the church; to admonish, to rebuke, to suspend, or exclude from the sacraments those who are found to

deserve censure ; to concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the congregation ; and to appoint delegates to the presbytery and the synod. Appeals may be made from their decisions, to the presbytery, and carried up to the higher judicatories. The business of the deacons is to take care of the poor ; and to them may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church. The ruling elders and the deacons are ordained, or solemnly set apart, to their respective offices, by a bishop.

All the ministers, (being not less than three in number,) and one ruling elder from each congregation, within a certain district, are formed into a presbytery. This body has power to receive and issue appeals from church sessions, and references brought before them in an orderly manner ; to examine and license candidates for the holy ministry ; to ordain, instal, remove and judge ministers ; to examine and approve or censure the records of church sessions ; to resolve questions of doctrine or discipline seriously and reasonably proposed ; to condemn erroneous opinions which injure the purity or peace of the church ; to visit particular churches, for the purpose of inquiring into their state, and redressing the evils that may have arisen in them ; to unite or divide congregations at the request of the people, or to form or receive new congregations ; in general to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their care ; and to appoint delegates to the General Assembly.

A synod is a convention of all the bishops, and one ruling elder from each congregation within a larger district than a presbytery ; and must include at least three presbyteries. The synod has power to receive and issue all appeals regularly brought up from the presbyteries ; to decide on all references made to them ; to review the records of presbyteries, and approve or censure them ; to redress whatever has been done by presbyteries contrary to order ; to take effectual care that presbyteries observe the constitution of the church ; to erect new presbyteries, and unite or divide those which were before erected ; and generally to take such order with respect to the presbyteries, sessions, and people under their care, as may be in conformity with the word of God, and the established rules, and which tend to promote the edification of the church.

The *General Assembly* is the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian Church. It represents in one body all the particular churches of this denomination, and constitutes the bond of union, peace, correspondence, and mutual confidence, among all our churches. It consists of an equal delegation of bishops and elders from each presbytery in the following proportion, viz. : each presbytery consisting of not more

than twenty-four ministers, is entitled to be represented by one minister and one ruling elder; and each presbytery consisting of more than twenty-four ministers, is entitled to be represented by two ministers and two elders; and in the like proportion for every twenty-four ministers in any presbytery. These delegates are styled *commissioners to the General Assembly*.

This body is empowered to receive and issue all appeals and references which may be regularly brought before it from the inferior judicatories; to review the records of every synod, and approve or censure them; and to give their advice and instruction in all cases submitted to them in conformity with the constitution of the church. To it also belongs the power of deciding in all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline; of reproving, warning, or bearing testimony against error in doctrine, or immorality in practice, in any church, presbytery or synod; of erecting new synods when it may be judged necessary; of superintending the concerns of the whole church; of corresponding with foreign churches, on such terms as may be agreed upon by the assembly and the corresponding body; of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations; and, in general, of recommending and attempting reformation of manners, and the promotion of charity, truth, and holiness, through all the churches under its care.

The General Assembly is required to meet at least once in every year. And when the whole business that may have come before it, has been finished, and the time and place for the next meeting appointed, it is dissolved; and another General Assembly, chosen in like manner, is required to meet as its successor.

For carrying out the objects of organizing these various judicatories, the constitution has prescribed a body of rules, adjusted with great care to the various emergencies to which they are to be specifically applied, and constituting a very admirable code, under which the rights and freedom of every minister and member are intended to be guarded against injustice and oppression, while it has an efficient tendency to require obedience to the laws of Christ, on the part of all persons in our communion, and of restraining the disorderly, and excluding the contumacious and the impenitent.

Before any overtures or regulations, proposed by the General Assembly, to be established as constitutional rules, can be obligatory on the churches, the assembly must transmit them to all the presbyteries, and receive the returns of at least a majority of them, in writing, approving thereof.

II. HISTORY.

For centuries before the Reformation, the whole territory of nominal Christendom, with the solitary exception of the Alpine wilderness between Gaul and Germany and Italy, was covered with gross darkness and superstition, and oppressed by spiritual, and civil and ecclesiastical despotism. The occurrence of that splendid and benign event, was the occasion of reviving the truths and institutions of primitive Christianity, and thus, of restoring civil and religious liberty.

It is remarkable that wherever the Reformation pervaded, and in whatever degree it made progress, both on the continent of Europe and in the British Isles, there was an entire agreement among the Reformers, with respect to the truths of the evangelical system. The great doctrine of justification by faith, together with all those correlate truths which make up the harmonious system, subsequently known by the name of Calvinism, every where prevailed; and however different from each other the *forms* under which the Reformed Churches were organized, they acknowledged each other as true churches of Jesus Christ, and mutually cherished a beautiful sympathy and fraternal intercourse.

But as the Reformation was commenced and carried on under different auspices and circumstances, this fact gave birth, especially in Great Britain, to a series of events, which had the most important influence on the organization and character of the churches, both of England and of Scotland; on the condition of the people of both kingdoms; and, ultimately, on the settlement of this country, and the planting of the Church of God on these shores.

On the Continent, the Reformed Churches of Germany, Switzerland, France, and Holland, were organized on the platform of Presbyterianism; *that is*, on the essential principles of the parity of the ministry, the association with them of ruling elders for the government of the church, and the gradation of consistorial, classical and synodical assemblies.

In England, the Reformation begun in royal caprice or passion. The sovereign seized upon the power formerly possessed by the Pope, and became *head of the church* as well as of the state. The consequences were soon apparent. The Reformation was made subservient to the arbitrary will of a despotic monarch, through the pernicious element of his ecclesiastical supremacy. Not only was episcopacy thus imposed upon the church, but the progress of reformation was rendered unsteady and fluctuating in the struggle which soon arose,

between the courtly and prelatic rulers of the Church and the Puritans, as they were afterwards called, who wished to effect a farther advancement in purity and in truth, and bring about a complete reform, in doctrine, worship and order. The disputes commenced ostensibly in respect to ecclesiastical vestments, but included, as various emergencies produced them, controversies between all the points of a simple, scriptural worship, and the gorgeous rituals and superstitious observances which had descended from Popery. Oppression was on the side of power. Persecution arose; and the progress of civil and religious despotism became rapid. These consequences advanced steadily through the reigns of Elizabeth, James I. and Charles I., and becoming unendurable, at length involved the nation in civil war; and an outraged people, rising in their might against tyranny, overturned the government both in church and state. During the progress of these events, the principles of the Puritans were widely diffused, and finally prevailed in the Parliament and in the nation; they were embodied in the ecclesiastical formularies composed by the Westminster Assembly, which met in A. D. 1643; and being adopted by the Parliament, A. D. 1649, Presbyterianism became the established religion. Dissensions, however, arose between the assembly and the Parliament, which ended in the overthrow of the new establishment, in the restoration both of monarchy and episcopacy, under Charles II., and in a bitter renewal of the persecutions against the Puritans. In the mean time a portion of the Puritans, (who were of that party which preferred Congregationalism,) sought a refuge in the wilds of America; and the Pilgrims of the Mayflower laid on Plymouth Rock the foundations of their institutions in the New World.*

In England alone, of all countries where the Reformation gained

* At this period it would seem that Presbyterianism, both as to government and doctrine, included the far greater number of the Puritans of England; and the form of government which was adopted by the early churches of New England, had at the least a much stronger resemblance to the Presbyterian polity than that which now exists in that part of our country. And these two facts may account for the ease with which the greater part of the Puritans who emigrated to America south of New England, and of those who emigrated from New England, to the same territory, coalesced with the Presbyterians in the earlier times of our church, and became thoroughly identified with it.

The infusion of Congregationalists emigrating from New England was comparatively small as to numbers, in the beginning of the Presbyterian Church; and not only did those elements readily coalesce with Presbyterianism, so as to lose their formal distinctive character altogether, but they were prepared beforehand to do so, from the fact that, at that early period the old leaven of Presbyterianism, which the Puritans of England so generally adopted, had not lost its vitality under those influences and circumstances which had given such a preponderance to Congregationalism in New England, as Presbyterianism had had over it in Old England, about the times of the Westminster Assembly.

any footing, was the Episcopal form of government found in the Reformed church.

In Scotland the Reformation was, from the beginning, a purely ecclesiastical and popular movement. "Patrick Hamilton, the noble and youthful friend of Luther and Melancthon, learned the doctrines of the Reformed faith, and taught them to his countrymen, till his testimony was sealed with the blood of martyrdom, A. D., 1528. Wishart gave an additional impulse to the sacred cause, equally by his teaching and his death. Several of the Popish priesthood were converted, and aided in converting others. John Knox caught up the same testimony; and though, by the commanding power of his genius, and the unconquerable energy of his character, he caused the voice of religious reformation to be heard throughout the kingdom, equally by prince and peasant, in the palace and the cottage: still it was simply and essentially a religious reformation, taking its form and impress directly from the word of God alone, encountering at every step the formidable opposition of civil powers and political intrigues, instead of receiving from them its bias and its external aspect. Believing that God's word contained the only authoritative direction for doing God's work, the Scottish reformers made their sole appeal 'to the law and to the testimony;' and though they respected the great continental Reformers, they sought the principles of doctrine, discipline, and government, from no foreign model, but from the holy scriptures alone. Thus it was that the Church of Scotland framed its Confession of Faith, and its First Book of Discipline, and met, in its first General Assembly, for its own government, in 1560, seven years before it had even received the sanction of the legislature. From its origin it had to encounter the world's opposition; in its growth it received little or nothing of a worldly admixture; and when it reached somewhat of a matured form, it still stood opposed to the world's corrupting influence."—*Hetherington*.

James VI., in order to secure uniformity in religion throughout his dominions, and to obtain for himself that supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs which he foresaw he could never obtain over a free General Assembly, bent all his resources of craft, treachery, and force, to subvert Presbyterianism and substitute Episcopacy. After his accession to the throne of England, (as James I.) he partially succeeded, in utter disregard of the sentiments of the great majority of the Scotch, in procuring the appointment of bishops, the introduction of certain rites and ceremonies, and the partial suppression of General Assemblies. His unhappy son, Charles I., under the counsels of Laud, attempted to complete the work which his predecessor had begun.

The Scots were thoroughly roused to resistance. The Assembly of 1638 threw off the modified Episcopacy which had been foisted on the church; and its act was confirmed by the Scotch Parliament in the following year. A successful stand was made by the nation against the army raised by Charles to coerce them. The Westminster formularies were adopted by the General Assembly, and ratified by Parliament. And Presbyterianism, which was indeed the religion of the whole nation, maintained its ground until 1660. Then, upon the accession of Charles II., renewed attempts were made by that profligate monarch and by the minions of Prelacy, to subvert Presbytery. These attempts brought on a violent struggle, which lasted for twenty-eight years,—the blackest period of Scottish history,—when the malicious bigotry that sought to dragoon the church into Episcopacy was checked. The principles which, half a century before, had contributed to bring on that “Great Rebellion,” as courtly and prelatical writers have called it, and which was crushed for a season, by the accession of Charles II., still lived; and being farther stimulated by the very persecutions of that insolent tyranny which in the flush of success became more resolute to quell them, they spread abroad more extensively and powerfully than ever, both in England and Scotland. The Revolution of 1688 was effected; James II. was expelled from the throne, and William and Mary established thereon, by the almost unanimous suffrages of the British people; and thus was a more secure basis laid for the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty. Then, the Presbyterians of Scotland had peace.

The Presbyterian Church in Ireland was mainly the offspring of Presbyterian emigration from Scotland, and, as in the sister kingdom, it grew up under severe persecutions and sufferings.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States, derives its lineage from the Presbyterians both of Ireland and Scotland. It is true, as has been before stated, that Presbyterianism was the form, not only of the Church of Scotland, but also of the Reformed Churches on the continent of Europe, and indeed of the Puritans of England about the time of the Westminster Assembly; and contributions from all these sources have been made at various times to the elements of the American Presbyterian Churches. But still, it is unquestionable, that the early founders of this church were principally Scotch and Irish Presbyterians. In like manner, the Church of Scotland was more than any other their model, in the whole arrangement of their judicatories, and in their whole ecclesiastical nomenclature, with few exceptions. And on this account, the Presbyterian Church in this country has al-

ways been popularly and appropriately regarded as the daughter more especially of the Church of Scotland.

The persecutions which drove so many of the early settlers to this country fell, in the first instance, heaviest on the Independents and Quakers; and when it came upon the Presbyterians, (at least those of Scotland,) it did not drive them so generally from their own country; but led to a protracted struggle for liberty at home—a struggle which, as we have seen, was eventually crowned with success. The opportunities at that time to emigrate were also few and far between, and a very small number only could take their flight; and hence, until the revolution in 1688, but few Presbyterians had become residents of the then British provinces in America. And as they did not at first emigrate in large bodies, but came, as a general rule, as individuals, or in small companies, they did not occupy by themselves extensive districts of country, but settled in the midst of other denominations. Thus, scattered as they were, it was only gradually that they became sufficiently numerous in any one place to form congregations, or to associate in a presbyterial capacity.*

From the period of the accession of William and Mary to the British throne, the Presbyterians began to remove from Scotland and northern Ireland, to America. The first Presbyterian Church in the colonies which now can be distinctly traced, was organized at Philadelphia, a short period before the commencement of the eighteenth century, and almost coeval with it was the formation of four or five churches on the eastern shore of the Chesapeake Bay.

The primary ecclesiastical union of the American Presbyterians occurred in 1706, when the Presbytery of Philadelphia was formed. It consisted of *seven* ministers—Samuel Davis, John Hampton, Francis McKemie,* and George McNish, all from Ireland, and residing in Maryland—Nathaniel Taylor, settled at Upper Marlborough, and John Wilson, officiating at Newcastle, both from Scotland—and Jedediah Andrews, of Philadelphia, from New England. To whom

* Francis McKemie was the first Presbyterian minister on the western continent. He seems to have been one of the Christians who had experienced much opposition and persecution for the truth's sake, during the reigns of Charles II. and James II., in Ireland. His characteristics eminently qualified him for a pioneer in those colonies where the bigoted Prelatists had the sway. He possessed handsome intellectual endowments, with dauntless fortitude, a commanding extemporaneous eloquence, and a burning zeal for the gospel. In New York, in January, 1707, he was illegally arrested and imprisoned by the colonial governor, for the heinous crime of preaching the gospel. The admirable defence which he made upon that occasion, resulted in his acquittal and deliverance.

was added John Boyd, stationed at Freehold, the first candidate who was ordained by that presbytery, on October 29, 1706.

According to the official statement of the Presbytery of Philadelphia in their letter to the Presbytery of Dublin, dated September, 1710, the whole number of the ascertained Presbyterians at that time is thus given: "In Virginia, one small congregation at Elizabeth river, with some few families in Rappahannoc and York. In Maryland, four; in Pennsylvania, five; and in the Jerseys, two; with some places in New York." This enumeration may profitably be contrasted with the statistical view of our Presbyterian Church, according to the returns of 1843; which are exclusive of all the other correlative Presbyterian communities.

After the presbyterial organization of those ministers and churches, their numbers and stability rapidly were augmented. They manifested much solicitude to collect the scattered people "favouring our way," who were opposed to the "Episcopacy established by law." To secure an efficient ministry, they wrote to Sir Edmund Harrison, an influential nonconformist of London; to the Synod of Glasgow; to the Presbytery of Dublin; to Cotton Mather; and to Mr. Reynolds, a prominent Independent minister of London, desiring their co-operation and aid. That correspondence is an interesting relic of the early times of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States, and is also an honourable memorial of all the parties.

The Presbytery of Philadelphia having become much enlarged; and in consequence of the increasing migration of persons from Scotland and Ireland having also become widely scattered: it was decided, at their meeting in September, 1716, to subdivide their body into "four subordinate meetings or presbyteries;" all of which were constituent members of the general body thenceforward denominated the "Synod of Philadelphia." By that division, the Presbytery of Philadelphia comprised *six* ministers with their churches; the Presbytery of Newcastle, *six* ministers and their churches; the Presbytery of Snowhill, *three* ministers and their churches; and the Presbytery of Long Island, *two* ministers and their churches, with the anticipated immediate addition of other congregations.

The first meeting of the Synod of Philadelphia was held in that city, September 17, 1717, and embodied *thirteen* ministers, with *six* elders.

At the meeting of the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1718, a striking memorial of *William Tennent* is recorded. It contains the reasons which he offered concerning his withdrawal from the established

church in Ireland. The synod ordered "that his reasons be inserted in the synod book, *ad futuram rei memoriam*."*

In the year 1718 the Synod of Philadelphia renewed their solicitations to the Presbytery of Dublin and the Independent ministry of London for additional preachers and other missionary assistance; at which period they state their number to be *twenty-three* ministers and *three* probationers.

At the meeting of the synod in 1721, there was made a declaration that the Presbyterians in America had exercised the Presbyterian government and discipline, according to the practice of "the best Reformed Churches, as far as the nature and constitution of this country will allow." The circumstances which caused that resolution do not appear. Six ministers protested against it; but at the meeting of the synod in 1722, the disputants agreed upon four articles—"Presbyteries, synods, and church-officers have executive power of church-government: they may decide upon the circumstantialia of church-discipline. Synods may compose directories. Appeals may be made to the superior judicatories, who should determine them." There is, however, an equivocal clause, which says, "Provided, that those 'Acts' of the ecclesiastical judicatories shall not be imposed upon such as conscientiously dissent from them."

In the year 1728 an overture was presented to the Synod of Philadelphia, respecting subscription to the "Confession of Faith, Catechisms, &c.," which was referred to the next synod. Although the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith and Catechisms always had been the only standard of faith, rites, government, and discipline: yet the book itself had never been formally announced as

* "The reasons of William Tennent for his dissenting from the established church in Ireland, delivered by him to the synod, held at Philadelphia, September 17, 1718: 1. Their government, by bishops, archbishops, deans, archdeacons, canons, chapters, chancellors, and vicars, is wholly unscriptural. 2. Their discipline by surrogates and chancellors in their courts ecclesiastic, is without a foundation in the word of God. 3. Their abuse of that supposed discipline by commutation. 4. *A diocesan bishop cannot be founded, jure divino, upon Paul's epistles to Timothy or Titus, nor any where else in the word of God, and so is a mere human invention.* 5. The usurped power of the bishops at their yearly visitations, acting all of themselves, without consent of the brethren. 6. Pluralities of benefices. 7. The churches conniving at the practice of Arminian doctrines inconsistent with the eternal purpose of God, and an encouragement to vice. Besides, I could not be satisfied with their ceremonial way of worship. Those, &c., have so affected my conscience, that I could no longer abide in a church where the same are practised.

"WILLIAM TENNENT."

the creed and the directory of the American Presbyterians. The overture of 1728 was designed to supply that alleged deficiency, which produced, in the following year, "The Adopting Act," which was a very important measure in its subsequent application to the authorized theological and practical system of the American Presbyterian Churches. The entire documents are found in the volume of Records containing the proceedings of the Synod of Philadelphia.

At the meeting of the synod in 1735 it was directed, "That each presbytery have the whole Adopting Act inserted in their presbytery book." Notwithstanding those apparently uniform avowals on the part of the synod of their undivided opinion, and of their obvious intention: yet there seems to have been a dissatisfaction among a portion of the churches respecting the true meaning of the synodical declaration. Therefore, to silence all cavils, the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1736, reiterated their testimony in an emphatic announcement, which was "approved, *nemine contradicente*."

That avowal was perfectly explicit, and was the cardinal rule and test of a Presbyterian's creed.

Although the Presbyterians were divided into two bodies from the year 1745 to 1758, yet upon the final agreement of the two synods at the latter period, in the terms of their union they adopted this clause, as the first article of their compact:

"Both synods having always approved and received the Westminster Confession of Faith and Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine, founded on the word of God: we do still receive the same as the confession of our faith; and also adhere to the plan of worship, government and discipline, contained in the Westminster Directory; strictly enjoining it on all our ministers and probationers for the ministry, that they preach and teach according to the form of sound words in the said confession and catechisms, and avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereto."

In 1737 the synod prohibited the members of one presbytery from preaching to the congregations within another presbytery, "without a regular invitation." The object of this rule was to restrain ministers, who travelled about preaching during the "great revival," from holding meetings in those places where, as the itinerants declared, there was a "graceless minister and a lukewarm presbytery." Moreover, in 1738, the synod resolved, that every candidate for the ministry should have a diploma from a college in Europe or New England, or a certificate of competent scholarship from a committee of the synod.

Protest.—In the following year, the opponents of those measures presented an “Apology for dissenting from those two new religious laws.” In that paper they assert, that there is a parity or equality of power among ministers; that a presbytery, or the smallest association of ministers, has power to ordain; and that they have authority to judge of the qualifications of candidates.

The synod’s claim to jurisdiction in the examination of candidates for the ministry was contested with great earnestness and some personal acrimony; and the Presbytery of New Brunswick formally protested against the power which the synod asserted. In 1741 a counter protestation was presented to the synod, which includes many historical illustrations of that period. It contains a denunciation of the “unwearied, unscriptural, anti-presbyterial, uncharitable, and divisive practices of the protesting brethren and their adherents.” The document is inserted entire in the Records of the Synod of Philadelphia.

The strife increased, until, in 1745, it was terminated by the organization of the Synod of New York.

Dr. Hodge thus accurately decides on this topic: “The majority were influenced by a sincere desire to secure an adequately educated ministry; and the minority, by the belief that the operation of the rule would be inimical to the progress of religion. The conduct of the New Brunswick Presbytery was precisely analogous to that of the Cumberland Presbytery, who refused to comply with the constitutional provisions as to the qualifications of candidates. It was not diversity of opinion as to doctrine or discipline, but loss of confidence, and alienation of feeling respecting the revival of religion.”

During the separation of the two synods, nothing of peculiar interest occurred, except the gradual enlargement of the number of ministers and churches, and the constant ineffectual attempts to promote an agreement between the dissidents. The differences of opinion upon the non-essential topics which had separated them, at length having wisely been obliterated, both synods dissolved, and the members of each assembled and constituted but one body, under the title of the “Synod of New York and Philadelphia;” which appellation they retained until the year 1788, when they divided themselves into four synods, preparatory to the first meeting of the General Assembly in 1789.

For the quarter of a century preceding the formation of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, the Presbyterians gradually increased in that part of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, around and above the southern termination of the Peaked Mountain. During that

period they were much harassed by the adherents of the Church of England in the province. In 1738 the Synod of Philadelphia applied to Mr. Gooch, then Lieutenant-Governor of Virginia, on behalf of their brethren, who returned a favourable answer, particularly respecting the scattered people who resided west of the Blue Ridge. The settlement of that district and the organization of those churches form an impressive and memorable portion of the early history of American Presbyterianism. Every obstacle was adopted to thwart the ministerial labours and success of the Presbyterian preachers, and to embarrass and distress them and their isolated disciples.* These facts are virtually implied in the formal application of the Synod of Philadelphia to the colonial authorities on behalf of their suffering brethren. They also are matters of family record among the members of the Presbyterian churches in those States; as, since the commencement of the present century, some of the primitive settlers then survived. Their immediate descendants now constitute the main body of the elder Presbyterian congregations in Western Virginia.

The Synod of New York and Philadelphia, at their primary meeting in 1758, comprised ninety-two ministers; who agreed that all their "differences and disputes should be laid aside and buried without future inquiry." The "Plan of Union" was unanimously approved; and the principles included in that compact have constituted, from that

* Stith, in his *History of Virginia*, p. 148, records that, in 1618, it was enacted by law, that "Every person should go to church on Sundays and holy days, or lie neck and heels that night, and be a slave to the colony the following week." For the second offence he was to be a "slave for a month;" and for the third offence, he was to be in bondage "for a year and a day." By a law of the year 1642, the very time when the prelatical hierarchy was subverted in Britain, it was enacted, that "No minister shall be permitted to officiate in this country, but such as shall produce to the governor a testimonial that he hath received his ordination from some bishop in England; and shall then subscribe to be conformable to the orders and constitutions of the Church of England; and if any other person, pretending himself to be a minister, contrary to this act, shall presume to teach or preach, publicly or privately: the governor and council are hereby desired and empowered to suspend and silence the person so offending; and upon his obstinate persistence, to compel him to depart the country with the first convenience."

Dr. Miller, in his *Life of Rodgers*, having recited the preceding anti-christian enactments, adds, "We are accustomed to smile at what are called the Blue Laws of Connecticut; but it would be difficult to find any thing in them equal to the first act above-mentioned." To which may be subjoined, that the source of the Virginia laws was bigoted intolerance, and the result of them, infidelity and irreligion, which still exist after the lapse of a century; while the laws of Connecticut originated in a devout solicitude for the glory of God and the spiritual welfare of men; and that the general effects of them appeared in the benign "fruits of righteousness."

time, the foundation upon which all the Presbyterian churches have been erected.

At that period there must have been great additions, by migration, to the Presbyterian denomination; as eight ministers more are reported in 1759, than in the preceding year, and the progressive enlargement of the churches continued until the commencement of the Revolutionary war. Indeed, of the religious population south of New England, during the existence of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, the Presbyterians must have increased more than any other denomination. The Episcopalians, in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina, almost disappeared. The Methodists, also, in consequence of John Wesley's opposition to the American Revolution, and the flight of the preachers to England, scarcely retained their numbers throughout the national contest. The Baptists did not develop their enterprise as they subsequently have done. The Presbyterians, however, maintained the meetings of their ecclesiastical bodies regularly, although with fewer numbers, and amid the interruptions which unavoidably accompanied the public agitation; but, during the thirty years prior to the formation of the General Assembly, by the number of emigrants from Scotland and the north of Ireland, the churches were both enlarged and multiplied. In 1789, there were *one hundred and eighty-eight* Presbyterian preachers, and *four hundred and nineteen churches*; of which two hundred and four were destitute of the stated ministry and ordinances.

The historical circumstances worthy of distinct remembrance, in connexion with the Presbyterian churches, previous to the formation of the General Assembly, may thus be specified in alphabetical order. Almost all of them were of a permanent character, in connexion with the ecclesiastical polity of the denomination.

Bibles and Religious Books.—As many of the Presbyterians were widely scattered, and it was impossible to answer the call for ministerial help: the synod, at several periods, distributed large quantities of the holy scriptures, and the works of Baxter, Doddridge, and others, among the hungry people famishing for “the bread of life.”

Domestic Missions.—In the year 1767 that interesting topic was discussed, and a plan was adopted to provide the instruments and means to execute the benevolent design; but the noble project was impeded by the subsequent political convulsions, and continued partially in abeyance until the formation of the “Standing Committee of Missions” in 1805.

Fasts and Pastoral Letters, with reference to the Revolutionary War.
—The members of the synod during the period that “tried men's

souls," from the commencement of the collision with Britain respecting the Stamp Act, until the treaty of peace, in 1782, were decided adherents of religious and civil liberty. Indeed this was the case with all Presbyterians of all denominations in the country. They were the sons of sires who had suffered for freedom in the Old World; and upon the renewal of attempts to bring the colonies under that despotism in Church and State, from which they had fled, one heart seemed to animate all classes and bodies of these sturdy opponents of tyrannical bigotry. From the journal of a convention held by delegates from the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, for some years before the breaking out of hostilities, it appears that great apprehensions were entertained of an attempt to establish the Church of England in this country, with all the odious and oppressive powers exercised by the bishops in that country. No more devoted Whigs were found in America than the people and ministers of every name in this land, who eminently unite the principles of that magnificent motto, "A Church without a bishop, and a State without a king." They went heartily into the cause of liberty. The pulpit and the press, the senate chamber and the battle-field, their murdered bodies, desecrated churches, and ravaged dwellings, bore witness to their own zeal, and the special hate of the ruthless invaders.

As a farther illustration of this part of the subject, the writer hopes to be pardoned, for quoting from himself: "In framing the constitutions of some of the old thirteen states, or in settling their polity as independent states, the separation of religious establishments from the state was, in some measure, the result of formal petitions to that effect, from large bodies of the clergy. Such was the fact, with respect to the Presbyterian ministers of Virginia. It was so in New York. Those men who have been stigmatized as the crafty intriguers for a union of Church and State, were men,—now speaking of nearly all the great evangelical denominations of the time, and especially of the Congregationalists and Presbyterians,—were men foremost in the works and conflicts of patriotism, in 'those days that tried men's souls.' It was Presbyterianism as to doctrine, and even a modification of it as to government, which settled New England, and made it the garden it is. And, without disparaging others, the Presbyterian Church may claim a large share of that influence which has produced the order, happiness, and prosperity of the middle and western portions of this country. *Presbyterianism* is eminently a system of public and private virtue. Patriotism owns it as her own ally and friend. To her, civil and religious liberty, under God, owe much of their present large extent. She sent these fountains of blessedness

through England in despite of the Tudors and the Stuarts; her own Scotland cherishes her as the guardian of the freedom which she purchased for that land with her blood, and for the Lordship of Christ in his own heritage in that land, she has perilled every temporal immunity; her principles and valour are indelibly interwoven with the self-denying and successful struggles with which Holland vindicated her liberties from the oppressions of 'kingly and of priestly tyranny';—and in the war of the American Revolution, the daring and generous heroism of her sons, her members and her ministers, in this land, stands nobly emblazoned among the soldiers, the statesmen and the patriots of those times. When others proved traitors and fled, or fought the battles of tyranny, they stood faithful. "When the Declaration of Independence was under debate in the Continental Congress, doubts and forebodings were whispered through that hall. The House hesitated, wavered, and for a while, the liberty and slavery of the nation appeared to hang in even scale. It was then an aged patriarch arose; a venerable and stately form; his head white with the frost of years. Every eye went to him with the quickness of thought, and remained with the fixedness of a polar star. He cast on the assembly a look of inexpressible interest and unconquerable determination; while on his visage, the hue of age was lost in the flush of burning patriotism that fired his cheek. 'There is,' said he, when he saw the House wavering, 'there is a tide in the affairs of men,—a nick of time. We perceive it now before us. To hesitate, is to consent to our own slavery. That noble instrument upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed this very morning by every pen in the House. He that will not respond to its accents and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unworthy the name of a freeman. For my own part, of property I have some—of reputation more. That reputation is staked, that property is pledged on the issue of this contest. And although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely rather they should descend thither by the hands of the public executioner, than desert, at this crisis, the sacred cause of my country.' Who was it that uttered this memorable speech, potent in turning the scales of a nation's destiny, and worthy to be preserved in the same imperishable record in which is registered the not more eloquent speech ascribed to John Adams on the same sublime occasion? It was John Witherspoon, at that day the most distinguished Presbyterian minister west of the Atlantic Ocean, the father of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

"Those men had suffered too much from the abuses of this adul-

terous union, and especially from the arrogance and bigotry of the prelatical establishments, even in the colonial state, to wish for the continuance of the union of Church and State. They had faith in their holy religion, and in the God who revealed it, to believe that he would prosper it without state patronage; and all they claimed was protection."

The pastoral letters of the synod at this time inculcate much well-timed admonition, and urgently advise all the churches to betake themselves to the throne of grace, there to seek their God, who was their only refuge and strength, and their very present help in time of trouble.

Literary Institutions.—Emulating the example of their Calvinistic brethren, the Puritans, the Presbyterians ever have manifested a quenchless solicitude for the advancement of literature, and especially for the dissemination of the "light and the truth." The "Log College" at Neshaminy, although Mr. Tennent's private institution, was the incentive to more combined effort, and was the pioneer for the Newark Academy, and the Philadelphia and Nassau Hall Colleges.

Union with other Denominations.—In the year 1766, a proposition was made in the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, for a correspondence with "the Consociated Churches of Connecticut"—and the matter was continually under discussion until the Revolution commenced,—after which the subject was disregarded until the General Assembly resumed the consideration of it in 1790.

In the year 1784, the Reformed Dutch Classis of New Brunswick, having complained of the conduct of some of the Presbyterian ministers, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia determined "to enter into an amicable correspondence upon subjects of general utility and friendship between the churches."

A joint conference of delegates of the Presbyterian, Reformed Dutch, and Associate Reformed Synods, was held in October, 1785; which resulted in the promotion of more confraternity between those three denominations.

Universalism.—One of the latest measures of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia was, to bear their testimony against the heresy propagated by them who deny the doctrine of future punishment. As the assertion of the boundless malignity of sin, and the never-dying anguish of the impenitent, is a solemn part of the Presbyterian faith, and the knowledge of that fact should be reiterated: the important declaration of the synod is here inserted.—"Whereas the doctrine of universal salvation, and of the finite duration of hell torments, has

been propagated by sundry persons who live in the United States of America; and the people under our care may possibly, from their occasional conversation with the propagators of such a dangerous opinion, be infected by the doctrine: the synod take this opportunity to declare their utter abhorrence of such doctrines as they apprehend to be subversive of the fundamental principles of religion and morality; and therefore earnestly recommend it to all their presbyteries and members to be watchful upon this subject, and to guard against the introduction of such tenets among our people."

The above particulars refer more directly to the external relations of the Presbyterian churches; the others of a permanent character belong to their interior discipline.

Candidates for the Ministry.—The controversy among the members of the synod was prolonged during two meetings in 1761 and 1762. It was founded upon the "*propriety*," and the "*right*," and the "*equity*" of demanding of the candidate an account of his personal religious exercises, and then making his statement the criterion of admitting or rejecting him. The whole subject was finally transferred to each presbytery, to act upon and decide as they considered most proper and evangelical.

This question was also propounded for the decision of the synod in 1783: "Whether a person without a liberal education may be taken on trials, or be licensed to preach the gospel? The question being put, it was carried in the negative." A similar inquiry was made of the synod in 1785, in these words: "Whether in the present state of the church in America, and the scarcity of ministers to fill our numerous congregations, the synods or presbyteries ought therefore to relax, in any degree, in the literary qualifications required of intrants into the ministry? And it was carried in the negative by a great majority."

Education.—In 1771, a plan for the education of poor and pious youth for the ministry of the gospel was submitted to the synod, and unanimously approved. The object, however, seems to have been forgotten during the turbulent times which followed; but subsequently it was revived, and by its benign operation it has been the chief means, through which the increasing demands of the churches and the people in the western settlements have been supplied with the ministry of the word and evangelical ordinances.

Foreign Ministers.—The admission of ministers from Britain and Ireland was a matter of peculiar difficulty, on account of the known and avowed Anti-Calvinistic principles of many of them. Great discrepancy of opinion existed, concerning the application of any precise

regulation to the applicants. In 1773, the topic was formally introduced in a rule precluding the reception of any foreign ministers by the presbyteries, without the previous approbation of the synod. Many were dissatisfied with this restriction; and the following year, the rule was mitigated. In 1782, on the restoration of peace, the subject was resumed; and in 1784, a general monition was addressed to the presbyteries and churches, warning them of their duty. Finally, the General Assembly adopted a plan which united caution with confraternity, and in accordance with it the presbyteries now decide.

Marriage.—The matrimonial relation has been one of the most prolific subjects of polemical discussion and appellate scrutiny in the ecclesiastical bodies of the Presbyterian churches. At the very first meeting of the Synod of Philadelphia, the marriage of a man with his brother's widow was the subject of a reference. From that day to this time, *one hundred and twenty-five years*, the precise meaning of the fourth section of the twenty-fourth chapter of the Confession of Faith, has been disputed by the ecclesiastical bodies; for they have adjudicated one year; rescinded on another occasion; re-enacted on a third; nullified on a fourth; referred back on the fifth; adopted an equivocal decision on a sixth; and virtually expunged, after a seventh protracted discussion.

From the proceedings of the elder synods and the General Assembly it appears that their decision has been required on the following examples: marriage, after the proof of adultery; the marriage of a brother's widow; the marriage of a half brother's widow; the marriage of a brother's and sister's relicts; the marriage of two sisters in succession, or of a deceased wife's sister; the marriage of a wife's brother's daughter; the marriage of a wife's half brother's daughter; the marriage of a wife's sister's daughter; and the marriage of a man who had not been legally divorced from his wife, in a case of long protracted obstinate desertion.

In the year 1761, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia decided that the marriage of a brother's or sister's relict, and of a deceased "wife's sister" were unlawful, and debarred all such delinquents from the communion of the church. But in 1772, concerning the marriage of a wife's brother's daughter, the synod apparently relaxed from their prior judgment. At the meeting of the synod in 1779, the marriage of a deceased wife's sister was introduced, and in 1782, the applicants were formally pronounced "capable of Christian privileges." The sentence of the synod produced so much dissatisfaction, that, in 1783, they adopted a long explanatory statement,

which certainly exhibits contradictions, against which a strong protest was entered on the synodical record.

The marriage of a deceased wife's sister has also been an inveterate theme of polemical strife during the whole half century, since the organization of the General Assembly; and is still the subject of "doubtful disputation." It has recently been revived, through the case of one of their ministers, who, having married the sister of his former wife, was condemned by the presbytery to which he belonged; and the General Assembly, after a protracted debate, affirmed the decision. But the party who are in favour of such marriages resuscitated the subject in the year 1843; and the question is now litigating: Whether the fourth section in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Confession of Faith shall be expunged, or explained so as to authorize the marriage of two sisters in succession?

Slavery.—This topic also, like that of marriage, has been a prolific source of contention. The primary notice of it is found in the proceedings of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, in 1786, under the form of two questions—"Whether the children of slaves held by church members should be baptized?" and "Whether the children of Christian professors, enslaved by irreligious men, ought to be baptized?" The synod replied in the affirmative.

In the year 1787, the matter was introduced before the synod in a more direct manner, and the result of their deliberation appeared in a testimony against it, and an urgent recommendation to "all their people, to procure the abolition of slavery in America." That "opinion" was reiterated in 1793; and in 1795, in reply to a petition, the same decision was confirmed, with a specific condemnation of all the traffic in slaves. At that period the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, &c., were published by order of the General Assembly. To the one hundred and forty-second question of the "Larger Catechism" was appended a note containing a definition of "man-stealing," with scriptural proofs. During the twenty years which followed, that *note* seems to have been overlooked; but in 1815, the subject of slavery was brought before the General Assembly, by a reference from the Synod of Ohio, and a petition from Virginia. The General Assembly then reiterated their declarations of 1787, 1793, and 1795. But in the following year, 1816, "the note connected with the scripture proofs in answer to the question in the Larger Catechism, What is forbidden in the eighth commandment? in which the crime of man-stealing and slavery is dilated upon," was ordered to be omitted in all "future editions of the Confession of this church." The subject

occupied several sessions of the General Assembly, in 1816, 1817, and 1818, at which last meeting, that body issued a long declaration, entitled "*A full Expression of the Assembly's views of Slavery.*" From that period, the disputatious theme has remained, in a great measure, *sub silentio*, among the Presbyterian ecclesiastical bodies.

The closing paragraph of Dr. Hodge's History is so suitable as a peroration to the history of Presbyterianism, down to the dissolution of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, that it is extracted as the termination of that part of this narrative. "The effects of the Revolutionary war on the state of our church were extensively and variously disastrous. The young men were called from the seclusion of their homes to the demoralizing atmosphere of a camp. Congregations were broken up. Churches were burned, and pastors were murdered. The usual ministerial intercourse and efforts for the dissemination of the gospel were, in a great measure, suspended, and public morals in various respects deteriorated. From these effects it took the church a considerable time to recover; but she shared, through the blessing of God, in the returning prosperity of the country, and has since grown with the growth, and strengthened with the strength, of our highly favoured nation."

THE FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY met in 1789, and the subsequent history of American Presbyterianism is chiefly a memorial of the more efficient and extensive developement of the evangelical features and the "ecclesiastical polity," which already have been delineated. However, there are four influential topics connected with the latter periods of the Presbyterian Churches which must be recorded.

The plan of correspondence and union eventually included the General Association of Connecticut, the General Convention of Vermont, the General Association of New Hampshire, the General Association of Massachusetts, and the Consociation of Rhode Island, with the Reformed Dutch General Synod, and the Associate Reformed Synod. The great object of it was to combine these ecclesiastical bodies and the churches whom they represented in a closer fraternity, and to enlarge their Christian intercourse, both as ministers and for the entire denominations. From the period of the first agreement the system has been continued with little interruption.

But a more distinct notice is requisite concerning the "Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the New Settlements," which was adopted in 1801. This plan was designed to extinguish any difficulties arising from a disagreement among Congregationalists and Presbyterians, so that they might all unite in the support of the ministry and sacred institutions; as their faith,

order of worship, and principles of church government substantially were one—there being only a “difference of administrations.” By that compact, a Presbyterian church might call a Congregational minister, and *vice versa*. If one body of Presbyterians and another of Congregationalists chose to unite as one church and settle a minister, each party was allowed to exercise discipline, and regulate its church affairs according to its own views, under the general management of a joint standing committee; and one of that committee, if chosen for that purpose, had “the same right to sit and act in the presbytery, as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church.” Under the operation of that “Plan of Union,” hundreds of churches were formed in the States of New York and Ohio, during the period from 1801 to 1837.

About the commencement of the nineteenth century, a remarkable religious awakening was manifest through a wide extent of the then “Far West.” New congregations were formed with exhilarating rapidity. To supply the ministerial destitution, it was resolved to secure the aid of men of piety and talents, although without a classical education, and to ordain them as missionary evangelists and pastors. Among the members of the Presbytery of Transylvania some opposed the measure; but as that body soon afterwards was divided, that portion of the body denominated the “Cumberland Presbytery” proceeded to license and ordain preachers who had not acquired a knowledge of the ancient languages, and of the other subjects of a collegiate course of study. The synod finally took cognizance of their proceedings, and appointed a “commission” to visit them, who summoned the presbytery, with their licentiates, candidates, and exhorters, to appear before them. When the commission met, they alleged a variety of charges against the presbytery, all of which were comprised within two general statements:—that they licensed “men to preach who had not been examined on the languages,” and that their licentiates had been required to adopt the Presbyterian Confession of Faith partially, or “as far as they believed it to agree with God’s word.”

The presbytery justified themselves upon the ground of the “extraordinary emergency,” the example of other presbyteries, and of the *New Testament*, which neither by example nor precept condemns the calling into the Christian ministry those whom the synod’s *commission* denominated “unlearned and ignorant men.” They also maintained that their candidates did not deviate in doctrine from any *essential* or important doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith. The synodical “commission” demanded, that the whole of the licentiates and candi-

dates, under the care of the Cumberland Presbytery, should be transferred to them for re-examination. The presbytery spurned at the exaction, as destructive of their privileges and independence; and the young preachers and exhorters also denied the jurisdiction of the "commission," when summoned before them. Thus the controversy remained during four years; until, in February, 1810, three of the ministers, as they said, "protesting against the unconstitutional and unprecedented acts of the synod, and of the General Assembly who justified them," constituted a separate presbytery, "known by the name of the Cumberland Presbytery."

They required of all candidates and licentiates, that they "receive and adopt the Confession and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church," except any "fatality taught under predestination;" and the requisition of an academical education.

The "Cumberland Presbyterians" have prodigiously multiplied. They now form a very influential religious community in the western districts of Kentucky and Tennessee.

In the year 1810 there was an increasing disposition for a closer union displayed by some of the most influential ministers and elders, and other members among the Associate Reformed body to combine with the Presbyterians. Eventually the measure was proposed with ecclesiastical formality; and after considerable negotiation, a large portion of the Associate Reformed Synod resolved upon that measure. That course produced a collision among them. The party who wished to unite with the other Presbyterians embodied themselves with the larger community in 1822; but their proceeding was attended by subsequent embarrassment. It involved the two denominations in litigation, which was not compromised, until after a vexatious dispute that continued during several years, and which terminated their ecclesiastical "correspondence and union."

In many aspects the disruption of the American Presbyterians which occurred in 1838, is one of the most interesting occurrences in the religious annals of the western continent. The narrative of the successive events which finally produced the separation of the conflicting parties, with their organization into two distinct communities, both bearing but one name, and both claiming to be the genuine integral body which had been subdivided, would combine a very instructive chapter of ecclesiastical history.

The collision ostensibly included two principal topics of controversy—*didactic theology*, and *church government and discipline*.

Prior to the year 1830 some laxity respecting the admission of ministers had been displayed by some of the presbyteries, thereby

opening a wide gate for polemical disputation. But at that period the First Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia called Mr. Barnes, then minister of the church at Morristown, to be their pastor. The case was submitted to the Presbytery of Philadelphia, at their meeting in April, 1830.

A long discussion ensued, which involved both theological doctrines and also points of discipline in reference to the correlate rights and duties of the presbyteries. The origin of the debate was a sermon previously published by Mr. Barnes, entitled "The Way of Salvation," to which objections were made, that it promulged opinions adverse to the Presbyterian "Confession of Faith and Catechisms." The call, however, finally was admitted, accompanied by a protest signed by twelve members; and the usual formalities with the Presbytery of Elizabethtown having been fulfilled, Mr. Barnes became the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia.

A "complaint" was made to the Synod of Philadelphia by the minority of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, based on their protest of the preceding April; and after the consideration of the whole subject, the synod, by a decisive majority, referred the examination of the sermon by Mr. Barnes, entitled "The Way of Salvation," with the cognate topics, to the presbytery. That body, in November, 1830, complied with the synodical direction: announced their disapprobation of the doctrines promulged in the sermon, and appointed a committee to visit and confer with Mr. Barnes, thereby to remove the difficulties which existed among them.

Moreover, another subject of contention had arisen, respecting the admission of persons into the Presbytery of Philadelphia. A "complaint" against the rule of the Presbytery of Philadelphia enforcing an examination of all persons who desired admission into that body was presented to the synod, who referred that subject to the General Assembly of 1832, with a protest by twenty-two ministers.

To accommodate Mr. Barnes and those who sustained him, the Assembly constituted the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia; which act the synod resisted as unconstitutional, and refused to enrol the members as part of the synod at their next meeting; which produced new "complaints, protests, and remonstrances," for review by the General Assembly of 1833.

The General Assembly of the year 1833 reversed the proceedings of the Synod of Philadelphia, by confirming the acts of the previous year; which brought up the whole controversy before the synod at their annual meeting. In the interim, a new principle of presbyterial

consociation had been enounced and acted on, by a departure from the usual geographical limits for presbyteries. It was denominated, in polemic technology, "elective affinity." The synod annulled the proceeding of the Assembly, and having dissolved the then Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, and combined the members with their old associates, proceeded to sever the whole original presbytery by a geographical line, drawn from east to west through Market Street, in the city of Philadelphia. At the same meeting of the synod a "Protest and Complaint" against the rule respecting the examination of ministers or licentiates desiring admission into the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and the synodical virtual approbation of that rule, were recorded for transmission to the General Assembly of 1834. The synod, however, had introduced another subject of conflict, by the formation of *their* new presbytery: so that there existed the *Second* Presbytery of Philadelphia, organized by the General Assembly, and the *Second* Presbytery constituted by the synod. About the same time the Synods of Cincinnati and Pittsburg formally interfered in the collision by impugning the proceedings of the General Assembly in reference to the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

The vacillating course of the General Assembly during some years, with the various attempts to compromise, as either of the parties seemed to acquire the preponderance,—for the actual division among the ministers and churches was avowed,—constantly augmented the strife in pungency and amplitude. To place the matter in a form which could not be evaded, Dr. Junkin, of the Presbytery of Newton, directly charged Mr. Barnes with holding erroneous opinions, as declared especially in his "Notes on the Romans." The case occupied the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia for some days, when that ecclesiastical body acquitted Mr. Barnes of "having taught any dangerous errors or heresies contrary to the Word of God," and the Confession of Faith and Catechisms. From that decision Dr. Junkin appealed to the Synod of Philadelphia who met in 1835. Prior to that period, the Synod of Delaware, which had been erected by the Assembly to include the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, was dissolved, and that presbytery was re-incorporated with the Synod of Philadelphia.

When Dr. Junkin's appeal came before the synod, according to the constitutional rule, the record of the case made by the presbytery appealed from, was required. They refused to submit the original copy of the proceedings to the synod. The synod, however, proceeded with the investigation upon the proofs that the detail of the charges, evidence, and proceedings laid before them, was an au-

thentic copy of the presbyterial record. Mr. Barnes refused to appear in his own defence, upon the plea that as the presbytery to which he belonged, and who had acquitted him, would not produce their "attested record" of the proceedings in his case, the trial, "whatever might be the issue," must be unconstitutional. After nearly three days' discussion, the synod *reversed* the decision of the Second Presbytery in the case of Mr. Barnes, "as contrary to truth and righteousness," and declared, that the errors alleged were contrary to the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, and that they contravened the system of truth set forth in the word of God; and they suspended Mr. Barnes from the functions of the gospel ministry. Against which decision, Mr. Barnes entered his complaint and appeal to the General Assembly of 1836.

The synod then dissolved the *Second* Presbytery of Philadelphia, which had been organized by the General Assembly, and also the Presbytery of Wilmington.

The General Assembly met in 1836, and those various "appeals," "complaints," and "protests," were discussed. That body rescinded all the acts of the Synod of Philadelphia—they absolved Mr. Barnes from the censure and suspension pronounced by the Synod of Philadelphia. They erected their former Second Presbytery anew, as the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia—they restored the Presbytery of Wilmington—and they virtually proclaimed, that the positions avowed by Mr. Barnes are evangelical, and consistent with the Presbyterian Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

The alienation between the two parties had constantly been increasing; but after the proceedings of the Synod of Philadelphia in 1835, and the measures of the General Assembly of 1836, it was manifest, that a decisive struggle would be made at the meeting of the General Assembly in 1837. The *strict* interpreters of the Confession of Faith had been in a minority of the Assembly in the years 1831, 2, 3, 4, and 1836. They therefore invited a convention to meet in Philadelphia, a week anterior to the opening of the General Assembly of 1837. The convention included one hundred and twenty-four members, most of whom also were delegates to the Assembly, and they continued in session until the General Assembly was organized. To that body the convention transmitted the result of their deliberations in a document entitled their "Testimony and Memorial." They bear testimony—

- I. Against *sixteen* doctrinal errors.
- II. Against *ten* departures from Presbyterian order.
- III. Against *five* declensions in Christian discipline.

They emphatically declared, in reference to the distracted church, among ministers and people, that mutual confidence is gone, and is not to be restored by temporizing measures.

IV. They then propose the "Method of Reform."

1. The immediate abrogation of the "Plan of Union" with Congregationalists, adopted in 1801.

2. The discontinuance of the American Home Missionary, and American Education Societies.

3. The severance of all churches, presbyteries, and synods, which are not strictly organized on Presbyterian principles.

4. The examination of all licentiates and ministers on theology and church government; and the requirement of an "explicit adoption of the Confession of Faith and Form of Government."

5. The separation from the Presbyterian Church of all presbyteries and synods, which are known to consist chiefly of unsound or disorderly members.

6. A *caveat* to be sent to all the national societies respecting their agents, that they should not interfere with the order and principles of the Presbyterian churches.*

* *Doctrinal Errors.*—The minute specification of the disputed themes of theology was reserved for this point, because the "Testimony and Memorial" of 1837, constituted the formal basis of the proceedings in the Assembly of that year; and also because the catalogue comprises the objections included in the protest offered to the Presbytery of Philadelphia, in April, 1830; the "errors" enumerated in the western memorial of 1834; and the charges of Dr. Junkin, in 1835.

The Convention of 1837 thus announce—

We hereby set forth in order some of the doctrinal errors, against which we bear testimony.

I. God would have been glad to prevent the existence of sin in our world, but was not able, without destroying the moral agency of man; or, that for aught which appears in the Bible to the contrary, sin is incidental to any wise moral system.

II. Election to eternal life is founded on a foresight of faith and obedience.

III. We have no more to do with the first sin of Adam, than with the sins of any other parent.

IV. Infants come into the world as free from moral defilement, as was Adam, when he was created.

V. Infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God in this world as brute animals, and their sufferings and death are to be accounted for, on the same principles as those of brutes, and not by any means to be considered as penal.

VI. There is no other original sin than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though by nature innocent, or possessed of no moral character, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency. Original sin does not include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering. There is no evidence in scripture, that infants, in order to salvation, do need redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost.

VII. The doctrine of imputation, whether of the guilt of Adam's sin, or of the righteousness of Christ, has no foundation in the word of God, and is both unjust and absurd.

The General Assembly of 1837 met, and, the adherents of the Convention having a decisive majority in that body, promptly acceded to the requests of the Memorial. They abrogated the "Plan of Union" between Presbyterians and Congregationalists. They adjudged that the four synods of Genessee, Geneva, Utica, and the Western Reserve were not "constituent parts" of the Presbyterian Church. The operations of the American Home Missionary, and of the American Education Societies were excluded from their churches, and the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia was dissolved.

The succeeding twelve months were devoted by both parties to preparation for the Assembly of 1838. By custom it devolves upon the permanent and stated clerks to make up the list of the members, who present their commissions for that purpose, anterior to the commencement of the sessions. These officers omitted all reference to

VIII. The sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental, and instructive only.

IX. The impenitent sinner by nature, and independently of the renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, is in full possession of all the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God.

X. Christ never intercedes for any but those who are actually united to him by faith; or Christ does not intercede for the elect until after their regeneration.

XI. Saving faith is the mere belief of the word of God, and not a grace of the Holy Spirit.

XII. Regeneration is the act of the sinner himself, and it consists in a change of his governing purpose, which he himself must produce, and which is the result, not of any direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart, but chiefly of a persuasive exhibition of the truth, analogous to the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another; or regeneration is not an instantaneous act, but a progressive work.

XIII. God has done all that *he can do* for the salvation of all men, and man himself must do the rest.

XIV. God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men, as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a particular manner, without impairing their moral agency.

XV. The righteousness of Christ is not the sole ground of the sinner's acceptance with God; and in no sense does the righteousness of Christ become ours.

XVI. The reason why some differ from others in regard to their reception of the gospel is, that they make themselves to differ.

The Convention pronounced these "errors unscriptural, radical, and highly dangerous," which in "their ultimate tendency, subvert the foundation of Christian hope, and destroy the souls of men."

The Convention, on church order and discipline, particularly specified as practices of which they complained: The formation of presbyteries founded on doctrinal repulsions as affinities. The refusal of presbyteries to examine their ministers. The licensing and ordination of men unfit for want of qualification, and who deny fundamental principles of truth. The needless ordination of evangelists without any pastoral relation. The want of discipline respecting gross acknowledged errors. The number of ministers abandoning their duties for secular employments, in violation of their vows. The disorderly meetings of members and others, thereby exciting discord and contention among the churches.

the delegates from the presbyteries comprised in the four synods which had been expunged from the ecclesiastical statistics by the previous Assembly. When the motion was made that the commissions from these presbyteries should be received, the moderator refused to recognise the motion, or the parties on whose behalf it was made. After a short interval of disorder, the minority, (including both the advocates of the synods who were excluded by the Assembly of 1837, and the commissioners from those synods,) united in disclaiming the authority of the moderator, and proceeded to organize by themselves; and having elected another moderator and clerks, the whole of the dissentients from the acts of the Assembly, in 1837, immediately withdrew, in a body, to the edifice occupied by the First Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia.

The majority retained their seats until the temporary confusion ceased, when they proceeded to their ecclesiastical business according to the prescribed ordinary forms.

The trustees and other corporate bodies among the Presbyterians possess much valuable property, for their seminaries and missionary institutions. Some time after the separation in 1838 had been consummated, the question, in whom that property was legally vested, was carried into the civil courts of Pennsylvania, in which state the trustees were incorporated. The Trustees of the General Assembly are elected by the General Assembly, who may change one-third of the number every year. The seceding Assembly elected one-third of the board as new members. When they claimed their seats at the board they were refused admission. A suit, therefore, was commenced, to obtain possession of the offices from which, as they contended, they were illegally excluded. The cause excited intense interest, and was primarily decided in favour of the claimants; for the true question litigated was this: Was the body who refused to acknowledge the four severed synods the true Assembly of the Presbyterian Church? An appeal to the Supreme Court was entered from the adjudication of the inferior tribunal. The superior court reversed the sentence of the lower court; and granted a new trial, with a construction of the law which in effect precluded the plaintiffs from obtaining their object, and the suit was withdrawn. Thus, so far as the legal decision in Pennsylvania operates, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States are recognised as that body, represented by their trustees who, in law, still hold that title, with its common property.

The effervescence of the strife now has almost disappeared; and the two bodies of American Presbyterians are actively pursuing their

own course. According to their statistical returns, they have increased during the six years from their separation, nearly *one-third* in actual numbers. Moreover, when we contrast the diversified additional instrumentalities to promote the Redeemer's kingdom, which have been put in operation by them, since their division in 1838; it is manifest, that, in capacity for the Lord's work, they have doubled their usefulness and enterprise.

Thus, from the smallest beginnings, when the little companies of the "Presbyterian Pilgrims" who first came to America, as it were, but with a "staff," here laid the foundations of this church, and reared it under manifold difficulties and annoyances, encountering obloquy and even persecutions: it has grown under the protection and favour of Providence, oft sharing the dew of the Holy Spirit, enlarging its borders in this genial land, and exerting a happy influence on the world, until now it has "become two bands."

Although not of this distinct denomination, the Reformed Dutch and German Reformed Churches in the United States, are Presbyterian and Calvinistic. Their standards of doctrine are the Articles of the Synod of Dort and the Heidelberg Catechism. The Reformed Presbyterian Church, or Covenanters, the Associate Church, and the Associate Reformed Church, and the body which separated from us in 1838, adopt the Westminster Standards as the symbols of their faith and order;—the last specified body having the same constitution as the Presbyterian Church, with the exceptions of the restriction which they have since put to the powers of the General Assembly, and of the substitution of triennial for annual General Assemblies.

And all these distinct denominations, including the Cumberland Presbyterians, and some smaller denominations, although for various causes they are arranged in separate bodies, compose a great Presbyterian family in the United States, which comprises upwards of *four thousand* ministers and nearly *six thousand* churches, and comprehends a population of three or four millions who, either as communicants or worshippers, are associated with them.

III. STATISTICAL.

According to the statistical tables, appended to the minutes of the General Assembly, for 1843, the Presbyterian Church in the United States, comprises 19 synods, or 105 presbyteries, 1434 ministers, 183 licentiates, 314 candidates for the ministry, 2092 churches, and 159,137 members in communion.

The existing institutions of the Presbyterian Church must be con-

cisely described. They may generally be divided into those connected with education, or literature, or missions.

Education.—This department comprises colleges, theological seminaries, and the “Board of Education.”

Colleges.—The establishments of learning at the following places, although not absolutely connected with, or directly controlled by Presbyterians exclusively, are generally considered as under their supervision, or are chiefly sustained by them.

New York.—Hamilton College; Union College, at Schenectady; New York University.

New Jersey.—Nassau Hall, at Princeton.

Pennsylvania.—Jefferson, at Cannonsburg; Washington College; La Fayette, at Easton.

Virginia.—Hampden Sidney, in Prince Edward county; Washington, at Lexington.

North Carolina.—University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill; Davidson, at Mecklenburg.

South Carolina.—South Carolina, at Columbia.

Tennessee.—University of Nashville.

Kentucky.—Centre, at Danville.

Ohio.—Miami University, at Oxford.

Indiana.—South Hanover College.

Theological Seminaries.—At Princeton, New Jersey; Western, at Allegheny, Pennsylvania; Union, in Prince Edward county, Virginia; Southern, at Columbia, South Carolina; Indiana, at New Albany, Indiana.

Board of Education.—The formal commencement of the work of education for the ministry, was the result of the proceedings of the General Assembly in 1806, when that duty was assigned to each presbytery. The inefficiency of the system induced the General Assembly, in 1819, to form the “Board of Education;” but during the interval until 1829, there was not the adequate result which was necessary to supply the demands for ministers. A new organization was then made; and the consequence has been manifested in a large augmentation of the funds, and a proportionate increase in the number of theological students maintained during their preparatory course.

Thirteen hundred and fifty young men have been assisted in their studies for the gospel ministry. Two-thirds of the foreign missionaries, and nearly one-half of the domestic missionaries, with a large proportion of the pastors of the Presbyterian churches at this time, have been introduced to the ministry through the aid of the “Board of Education.”

Literature.—This department comprises the miscellaneous publications, which are expressly devoted to promulge the doctrinal principles, and to defend the government and discipline of the Presbyterian churches.

There is a quarterly periodical, by Presbyterian writers, entitled the *Biblical Repertory and Theological Review*, which is devoted almost exclusively to disquisitions strictly religious, or to those which have a close affinity with them, either on Christian ethics or ecclesiastical history. Several weekly newspapers are issued by them, and very extensively dispersed. The *Presbyterian*, at Philadelphia; the *Presbyterian Advocate*, at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania; the *Presbyterian of the West*, at Springfield, Ohio; the *Protestant and Herald*, at Frankfort, Kentucky; the *Watchman of the South*, at Richmond, Virginia; and the *Observer*, at Charleston, South Carolina.

Board of Publication.—In addition to these miscellanies, the Presbyterians have organized a most important and efficient society, denominated the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, which was instituted for the purpose of disseminating standard volumes of theology and ecclesiastical history, and also tracts that elucidate and defend Presbyterianism. This board, which is elected by the General Assembly, has printed nearly fifty tracts, doctrinal, ritual, on Popery, historical, and for youth.

Nearly *one hundred and thirty* works have already been issued by the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, which may thus be classified: Biographical, nineteen; devotional, eight; doctrinal, twenty; experimental, seventeen; historical, seventeen; polemical, sixteen; practical, five; prophetic, five; and works adapted for youth, eighteen. The benign fruits, which this powerful typographical machinery is producing, can be estimated only by remembering the moderate price at which the works are sold, and the high character of the volumes themselves, a few of which are enumerated in the order in which they originally were published.

Brooks's *Mute Christian*; Halyburton's *Great Concern*; *Life of John Knox*; Charnock's *Discourses on Regeneration*; Guthrie's *Christian's Great Interests*; *Lime Street Lectures*; Bradbury's *Mystery of Godliness*; Flavel's *Divine Conduct*; Charnock's *Discourses on the Attributes of God*; Owen on the *Holy Spirit*; Charnock on *Christ Crucified*; Owen on *Justification*; Calvin's *Institutes*, translated by John Allen; Owen on *Indwelling Sin*; Sibbs's *Souls' Conflict*; Lorimer's *History of the French Protestants*; McCrie's *History of the Reformation in Italy and Spain*; the *British Reformers*, with their *Lives*, twelve volumes; Dailie's *Use of the Fathers*; Mead's *Almost*

Christian; Charlotte Elizabeth's English Martyrology, and the Lives of the British Reformers, separate from their writings.

The beneficial influence, under the divine auspices, which must result from the unrestricted dissemination of these and similar invaluable Christian productions, throughout the Republic, and especially among the *Household of Faith*, far transcends our utmost imagination; and the exhilarating anticipation cannot be otherwise expressed, than in the Psalmist's urgent petition, "O Lord, we beseech thee, send now prosperity!" Amen.

Missions.—This portion of the philanthropic labours of the Presbyterian churches is conducted by two distinct agencies and boards of managers.

Domestic.—The primary arrangements for Home Missions, under the committee appointed by the General Assembly, were comparatively restricted in extent and languid in their operations; until in 1828, the present efficient system was adopted, through which "there has been a gradual but constant increase in the number of missionaries, the amount of funds collected, the interest excited, and the good accomplished." Three hundred missionaries are now employed, while the prospect of usefulness in spreading the gospel never was more promising than at the present period. Signal success already has attended the work under the divine blessing; and every heart must exult in the glorious prospect, that "the righteousness" of Zion "shall go forth as brightness," and "the salvation" of Jerusalem "as the lamp that burneth."

Foreign.—"The first mission to the heathen, established by the Presbyterian Church, was among the Indians on Long Island, in the year 1741. David Brainard was the second missionary. His ordination took place in the year 1744, and the fields of his remarkable labours were at the forks of the Delaware, on the borders of the Susquehanna, and at Crossweeks in New Jersey. From that period increasing attention was given to this great subject, and various missionary societies were formed in which Presbyterians largely participated. This was particularly the case in the United Foreign Missionary Society, which after a brief career was eventually merged in the 'American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.'"

Notwithstanding, many Presbyterians were solicitous that their own churches should separately engage in the missionary work. In consequence of which, "In the year 1831, a determined and active effort was made by the Synod of Pittsburg, to awaken the church to a sense of her duty in this respect, by the organization of the 'West-

ern Foreign Missionary Society.' This society met with so much favour, that the General Assembly in 1835 resolved to engage the whole church in an enterprise worthy of her character and resources. The 'Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions' was organized in the year 1837, under favourable auspices, and to it was made an entire transfer of all that pertained to the Western Foreign Missionary Society.

"The experiment has succeeded, and the smiles of God have rested on that institution. Flourishing missions have been established among various tribes of American Indians, in Western Africa, Northern India, and China, and all the operations are carried on with great ability."

In Northern India, there is a synod of American missionaries in connexion with the General Assembly; comprising the Presbytery of Allahabad, of six ministers—the Presbytery of Furrukabad, of four ministers—and the Presbytery of Lodiana, of five ministers. The Board of Missions issues two monthly periodicals, the "Missionary Chronicle," and the "Foreign Missionary;" which are extensively dispersed, and effectually sustain the solicitude that is experienced to "send out the light and the truth."

The foregoing article claims to be but little more than an authentic compilation. The writer has freely copied and incorporated with his own language, the language of such of his authorities as suited his purpose, without specific notice. He takes this place to acknowledge his obligations of this sort to the authorities on which he has thus drawn, viz.: The Confession of Faith; Edinburgh Encyclopædia; Miller's Christian Ministry, and Presbyterianism; Histories of the Westminster Assembly, by Hetherington, and by the Presbyterian Board of Publication; and Hodge's Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church. He has also received very essential aid from the Rev. George Bourne, in the sedulous explorations of the official documents and records of the Presbyterian Church, and other reliable authorities, and in the arrangement and principal composition of that part of the historical sketch which commences with the formation of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and in the preparation of the statistical department.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

BY JOEL PARKER, D.D.,

PASTOR OF THE CLINTON STREET CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

THE character and peculiarities of the Presbyterian Church may be learned from the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America: containing the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Directory for the worship of God; together with the Plan of Government and Discipline as amended and ratified by the General Assembly at their session in the first Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, in May, 1840, and the annals of the church found in the published reports of the proceedings of its ecclesiastical judicatories. This church does not differ very materially in doctrine and worship, or in ecclesiastical government and order, from any of the great family of anti-prelatical churches that sprung from the Reformation, and which are commonly termed Calvinistic.

It acknowledges no authority in things pertaining to the doctrines and duties of the Christian Church, but the revealed will of God as found in the sacred Scriptures. It maintains—

That God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrine and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his word, or, beside it in matters of faith, or worship; that the rights of private judgment in all matters, that respect religion, are universal and inalienable, and that no religious constitution ought to be aided by the civil powers farther than may be necessary for protection and security, and at the same time be equal and common to all others.

That in perfect consistency with the above principle of common right, every Christian church, or union, or association of particular churches, is entitled to declare the terms of admission into its communion, and the qualifications of its ministers and members, as well as the whole system of its internal government which Christ hath appointed; that in the exercise of this right, they may, notwithstanding, err in making the terms of communion either too lax or too narrow;

yet, even in this case, they do not infringe upon the liberty or the rights of others, but only make an improper use of their own.

That our blessed Saviour, for the edification of the visible church, which is his body, hath appointed officers, not only to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments, but also to exercise discipline, for the preservation of truth and duty ; and, that it is incumbent upon these officers, and upon the whole church, in whose name they act, to censure or cast out the erroneous and scandalous ; observing, in all cases, the rules contained in the word of God.

That truth is in order to goodness ; and the great touchstone of truth is its tendency to promote holiness ; according to our Saviour's rule, " By their fruits ye shall know them." And that no opinion can be more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents as of no consequence what a man's opinions are. On the contrary, that there is an inseparable connexion between faith and practice, truth and duty. Otherwise it would be of no consequence either to discover truth or to embrace it.

That while the above principle is highly important, yet it is necessary to make effectual provision that all who are admitted as teachers be sound in the faith. Nevertheless there are truths and forms, with respect to which men of good characters and principles may differ. And in all these cases it is the duty, both of private Christians and societies, to exercise mutual forbearance towards each other.

That though the character, qualifications, and authority of church officers are laid down in the holy scriptures, as well as the proper method of their investiture and institution ; yet the election of the persons to the exercise of this authority, in any particular society, is in that society.

That all church power, whether exercised by the body in general, or in the way of representation by delegated authority, is only ministerial and declarative ; that is to say, that the holy scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners ; that no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority ; and that all their decisions should be founded upon the revealed will of God. Now though it will easily be admitted that all synods and councils may err, through the frailty that is inseparable from humanity : yet there is much greater danger from the usurped claim of making laws, than from the right of judging upon laws already made, and common to all who profess the gospel ; although this right, as necessity requires in the present state, be lodged with fallible men.

That if the preceding scriptural and rational principles be steadfastly adhered to, the vigour and strictness of its discipline will contribute to the glory and happiness of any church. Since ecclesiastical discipline must be purely moral or spiritual in its object, and not attended with any civil effects, it can derive no force whatever but from its own justice, the approbation of an impartial public, and the countenance and blessing of the great Head of the Church Universal.

These catholic and liberal views, are the basis upon which the structure of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, rests. It does not regard itself as *the* Church, but only as a particular *branch* of the Catholic or Universal Church of Christ, which consists of all those persons in every nation, together with their children, who make profession of the holy religion of Christ, and of submission to his laws. It regards Papacy and Diocesan Episcopacy as great usurpations of ecclesiastical power, and highly unfavourable to the dissemination of the pure gospel, and uncongenial with our republican institutions. Yet, while Presbyterians believe that the parity of the clergy, and a representation of the laity in the officers denominated ruling elders, are important features of the Apostolic Church, clearly discernible in the New Testament, they do not deny the validity of ordinances, because mixed with the errors and usurpations of prelacy. On the contrary they dare not disown any church which holds Christ the head, and which is by him made the instrument of edifying spiritual believers, and extending substantial Christianity.

The officers of the Presbyterian Church are bishops or pastors, ruling elders, and deacons. "The pastoral office is the first in the church both for dignity and usefulness." The person filling this office is designated by different names in the New Testament, names expressive of various duties. As he feeds the flock of God, he is called their pastor or shepherd. As he has the oversight of a congregation, he is called their bishop or overseer. As he is expected to exhibit the gravity and wisdom of age, he is called a presbyter or elder. As he is *sent* a messenger to the church, he is termed an angel. As he is entrusted with means of reconciling sinners, he is spoken of as an ambassador. And as he dispenses spiritual blessings, he is called a steward of the mysteries of God.

Ruling elders are elected by the people as their representatives. In conjunction with the pastor they exercise discipline. They are designated in the scriptures under the title of governments, and of those who rule well, but who do not labour in the word and doctrine.

Deacons are also regarded as distinct officers in the church. Their official duty is the care of the poor, and the reception and disburse-

ment of the charities of the congregation. These duties are often performed by the elders, and it is not deemed indispensable that deacons should be appointed, unless the interests of the congregation demand it.

The session consists of the pastor or pastors, and the ruling elders of a congregation, and is the primary judicatory of the church. The pastor is its presiding officer, called the moderator. This court, thus constituted, has power to watch over the spiritual interests of the congregation, to inquire into the Christian deportment of the members of the church, to call before them offenders, and also to investigate charges presented by others, to receive members into the church, to admonish, to rebuke, to suspend, or to exclude from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper those, who are found to deserve censure, according to the different degrees of their criminality. It is the business of the session also to appoint a delegate from its own body to attend with the pastor, the higher judicatories of the church. It is required to keep a fair record of all its proceedings, as also a register of marriages, baptisms, persons admitted to the Lord's table, deaths and other removals of church members, and to transmit these records to the presbytery for their inspection.

A presbytery consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each church, within a certain district. Three ministers, and as many elders as may be present, are necessary to constitute a quorum. The presbytery has power to receive and issue appeals from church sessions, and references brought before them in an orderly manner; to examine and license candidates for the holy ministry; to ordain, install, remove and judge ministers; to examine, and approve or censure, the records of church sessions; to resolve questions of doctrine or discipline, seriously and reasonably proposed; to condemn erroneous opinions, which injure the purity or peace of the church; to visit particular churches, for the purpose of inquiring into their state, and redressing the evils that may have arisen in them; to unite or divide congregations, at the request of the people, or to form or receive new congregations; and in general to perform whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their care. The presbytery also keeps a full record of its proceedings; and its doings are subject to the revision of the synod, which is a court of appeal standing in a similar relation to the presbytery with that of the presbytery to the church session.

A synod is a convention of the bishops with one elder from each church in a larger district; it must include at least three presbyteries. The synod is the court of the last resort in all cases of a judicial

nature, so that the whole appellate jurisdiction of the church is limited to its final decision as a **PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY**; having supreme control in its own appropriate sphere, though subordinate to the General Assembly, as to the review and constitutional oversight of its acts.

The synod reviews the records of presbyteries, approving or censuring their proceedings, erecting new presbyteries, uniting or dividing those which were before erected, and taking a general care of the churches within its bounds, and proposing such measures to the General Assembly, as may be for advantage to the whole church. The General Assembly is the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian Church.

It is not necessary to Presbyterian government, nor is any court higher than the presbytery; but it has the advantage of representing all the congregations of this denomination in one body. It is constituted of an equal delegation of bishops and elders, in the proportion of one minister and one elder from each presbytery; and these are styled, *commissioners to the General Assembly*.

Since the session of 1840, the Assembly exercises no judicial power, as it had formerly done, the synod now being the highest court of appeal.

In other respects the General Assembly possesses powers analogous to those of the inferior courts, in reviewing the records of synods, and approving or censuring them. It also gives advice on subjects brought up to it in an orderly and consistent manner; and constitutes a bond of union among all the churches. To the General Assembly also, belongs the power of deciding in all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline; of reproving, warning, and bearing testimony against error in doctrine, or immorality in practice in any church, presbytery, or synod; of erecting new synods when it may be judged necessary; of superintending the concerns of the whole church; of corresponding with foreign churches, on such terms as may be agreed upon by the Assembly and the corresponding body; of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations; and, in general, of recommending and attempting reformation of manners, and the promotion of charity, truth, and holiness, through all the churches under their care: *provided*, that all these powers and relations of the Assembly shall be construed as exclusive of all the proper appellate jurisdictions of the church, in cases of a judicial nature. No modification of the constitution, or of constitutional rules can be introduced by the General Assembly, till such modifications shall have been transmitted to the presbyteries, and written answers approving of the same shall have been returned by at least a majority of them. The sessions of

the General Assembly are held regularly once in three years. The synods meet annually, and the presbyteries once in six months.

There are provisions also, in the form of government, for convening any one of these judicatories for a special meeting, if any special exigencies shall demand such a step.

The public worship of God in the Presbyterian Church is not conducted by a prescribed liturgy. This church thinks it obvious that no forms of prayer, no prescribed liturgies were used in apostolic times, and she dares not introduce human inventions into the mode of her worship. It cannot be supposed that Paul kneeled down on the shore, when he parted with his friends at Tyre, and *read* a prayer from a book; or that Paul and Silas used a prescribed form when they prayed at midnight in the prison at Philippi. The Lord's Prayer forms no objection to these views, because it is not given in the same words by any two of the Evangelists. Besides, it contains no clause asking for blessings in the name of Christ, which our Saviour himself solemnly enjoined upon his church, before he withdrew his personal presence. In the subsequent inspired history we find no allusion to this form of prayer, nor any reference to either *saying* or *reading* of prayers, both of which modes of expression are natural for those who employ precomposed forms. Socrates and Sozomen, respectable ecclesiastical writers of the fifth century, both declare, that in their day, "no two persons were found to use the same words in public worship." And Augustine, who was nearly their contemporary, declares in relation to this subject, "There is freedom to use different words, provided the same things are mentioned in prayer."

In forming her "Directory for the Public Worship of God," the Presbyterian Church regards the holy scriptures as the only safe guide; therefore she does no more than to recommend a judicious arrangement of the several parts of the public service, throwing upon the pastor the responsibility of preparing himself for a proper and edifying performance of those acts of worship, which shall be suited to the ever-changing wants of the congregation.

The sacraments of the church are regarded as being two only: baptism and the Lord's Supper. The former is ordinarily performed by Presbyterians by applying the water to the subject, though they do not deny the validity of immersion. Baptism is administered to adult believers and their infant offspring; but none are admitted to participate in the Lord's Supper who have not given evidence of personal piety, and of understanding the significance of the ordinance.

No rite is looked upon as possessing any intrinsic influence. Presbyterians do not believe that an influence of a mysterious kind passes

from the hands of the presbytery into the spiritual nature of one set apart by them to the sacred office. On the contrary they regard the call to the ministry as proceeding from God. The candidate professes to have been moved by the Holy Spirit to desire the sacred office. He declares that he does, as far as he knows his own heart, seek the office of the holy ministry from love to God, and a sincere desire to promote his glory in the gospel of his Son. When the presbytery is satisfied that these professions have been made sincerely, and understandingly, they impose hands upon the candidate as a solemn recognition of one, whom they believe God has by his providence and grace "put into the ministry."

They deny also that any mysterious grace accompanies the water in baptism, or that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper possess any new qualities after a blessing has been invoked by the officiating clergyman. They look for no other influence from religious rites than that, which results from a wise adaptation for enforcing truth, by striking symbols, and creating hallowed associations. They deprecate the doctrine of the transmission of a power to human hands to create ministers at will, or to convey certainly any grace to sinners, as tending to inflate the ministry with pride, to impart to them an influence which God never intended, and to sink the people into a degrading superstition.

From the same apprehension of the evils of superstition, and from the want of a warrant in the word of God, they reject Godfathers and Godmothers, and the sign of the cross in baptism, and holy days, and kneeling in the Lord's Supper and bowing at the name of Jesus, and the rite of confirmation, and the efficacy of consecrated grounds in the burial of the dead.

The doctrines of the Presbyterian Church are Calvinistic. They are so called, not because Calvin invented them. They were the doctrines of all the leading Reformers; of the Waldenses, for five or six hundred years before the Reformation; of Augustin and the primitive Church, and especially are they distinctly exhibited in the word of God. This system of doctrine is clearly set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms.

Without pretending to expound fully the great principles, more amply unfolded in the standards of the church, we may say, briefly, that the Presbyterian Church maintains that, since the fall of Adam, and in consequence of his lapse, all men are naturally destitute of holiness, alienated entirely from God, and justly subject to his eternal

displeasure. The plan of man's recovery from this state is, from first to last, a system of unmerited grace. The mediation of Jesus Christ, including his instructions, his example, his sacrifice on the cross, his resurrection, ascension, and intercession, are the means of bringing men back to God. Yet these means would be without efficacy, if there were not revealed to man a gratuitous justification through the merit of our Saviour's sacrifice, and if the Holy Spirit did not by his own invisible agency cause sinners to accept a free pardon and salvation. Hence the provisions of mercy are gratuitous, not only depending on the sovereign grace of God, but the disposition to accept these provisions is produced by a sovereign interposition of the divine Spirit. It is evident, from scripture, and from daily observation, that all are not saved; and, consequently, that it was not the original purpose of Him who never changes his plans of operation, to bring all to repentance and faith in the Redeemer. "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. All the dispensations of his grace, as well as of his providence, and among the rest the effectual calling and salvation of every believer, entered into his plan from all eternity." "Yet so as that thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established."

It is undeniable that these views may be perverted and misrepresented, and rendered odious by drawing inferences from them which Presbyterians do not allow. For such perversions those of no creed are responsible. If we might refer to a single argument in which the distinguishing peculiarities of the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church are most triumphantly maintained, it should be that masterly homily of the Apostle Paul, or rather of the Holy Spirit, dictated to the apostle as his amanuensis, comprised in his Epistle to the Romans.

Whatever odium has been cast upon the Presbyterian Church for holding Calvinistic doctrines, it ought to be remembered that the honour of bearing it does not belong to them. It belongs to all the Reformers, to the symbols of the Synod of Dort, the Heidelberg Confession and Catechism, and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Established Church of England, and of the Episcopal Church in this country. If the English Church has fallen into such a spiritual state that the Earl of Chatham was justified in saying, "We have a Popish liturgy, a Calvinistic creed, and an Arminian clergy;" and if the churches on the continent of Europe have sunk to a lower condition, because a vigorous dissent has not infused a little spiritual life into the establish-

ments: surely the Presbyterians of Scotland and America are not worthy of very severe censure for keeping alive, at the same time, the doctrines of Calvinism and the spirit of piety.

The genius and character of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America, has been modified by a union of churches possessing some varieties of feature, while agreeing in the great leading principles of Presbyterian government and Calvinistic doctrine. In 1689, the Presbyterian and Congregational denominations in Great Britain consummated a union of the two denominations, adopting what they call the Heads of Agreement, embracing a few cardinal principles which were to govern them in their fraternal intercourse. This Presbyterian and Congregational union, sent over one of their number, the Rev. Francis McKemie, as a missionary to the new settlements in America. This devoted missionary, who had previously laboured here with apostolic zeal, and who has been properly styled the father of Presbyterianism in America, in connexion with six others, viz., Messrs. McNish, Andrews, Hampton, Taylor, Wilson, and Davis, in 1704 or 1705, formed the first presbytery in this country, the Presbytery of Philadelphia. This presbytery was formed upon the principles that governed the London association, and was composed partly of Presbyterian, and partly of Congregational churches. The Presbyterianism was that of the Church of Ireland, and was more flexible in its character than that of the Scottish Kirk. It more easily coalesced with the Congregationalism of the English Puritans. The Rev. Mr. Andrews, the first pastor of the first Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, was a Congregational Presbyterian. That church was under the care of the presbytery sixty-four years before they elected ruling elders. Presbyterianism gradually extended itself till, in 1716, the Synod of Philadelphia was formed out of the Presbyteries of Philadelphia, New Castle, Snow Hill, and Long Island. The Church of Scotland, instead of imbibing these principles which resulted in the Union of 1689, and in the establishment of a modified Presbyterianism in America, solemnly bore their testimony against religious toleration. In 1724, those ministers from Scotland who, in the language of Dr. Miller, "were desirous to carry into effect the system to which they had been accustomed, in all its extent and strictness," began to insist that the entire system of the Scottish Church be received in this country. The collisions thus occasioned at length subsided in the Adopting Act of 1729, the liberal principles of which were embodied in the following language: "Although the synod do not claim or pretend to any authority of imposing our faith on other men's consciences, but do profess our just dissatisfaction

with, and abhorrence of such impositions, and do not only disclaim all legislative power and authority in the church, being willing to receive one another as Christ has received us to the glory of God, and admit to fellowship, in church ordinances, all such as we have ground to believe that Christ will at last admit to the kingdom of heaven; yet, we are undoubtedly obliged to take care that the faith once delivered to the saints be kept pure, and uncorrupt among us, and do therefore agree, that all the ministers of this synod, shall declare their agreement in, and approbation of the Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, as being in all essential and necessary articles, good forms, and sound words and systems of Christian doctrine, &c. And we do, also, agree that the presbyteries shall take care not to admit any candidate, but what declares his agreement in opinion with all the essential and necessary articles of said Confession. And in case any minister or any candidate shall have any scruples with regard to any article of said Confession or Catechisms, he shall declare his sentiments to the presbytery or synod, who shall, notwithstanding, admit him to the exercise of the ministry within our bounds, if they shall judge his scruples or mistakes to be only about articles not essential and necessary in doctrine, worship, and government. And the synod do solemnly agree, that none of us will traduce or use any opprobrious terms towards those who differ from us in those extra-essential and not necessary points of doctrine, but treat them with the same friendship, kindness, and brotherly love, as if nothing had happened."

After some years this spirit of conciliation and charity gave place to a determination on the part of some, to enforce the more rigid forms of the Scottish Church. This led to the first great schism of the Presbyterian Church in 1741, and to the formation of the Synod of New York, in 1745.

In 1758, which was fifteen years after the separation, the Synods of New York and Philadelphia were united. No cause of disunion had been removed, except that greatest cause of division: ambitious men and evil tempers; for when the reunion took place, they agreed to adopt the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Directory, as they had been adopted in 1729. In 1766, eight years after the union of the synod under the name of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, that body proposed a convention of delegates of the pastors of the Congregational, Consociated, and Presbyterian Churches in North America, which was held annually for ten years, when it was interrupted by the American Revolution. In 1788 the General Assembly was organized, and in 1790 the Assembly "being peculiarly desirous

to renew and strengthen every bond of union between brethren so nearly agreed in doctrine and forms of worship, as the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches evidently are, do resolve that the Congregational Churches of New England, be invited to renew their annual convention with the clergy of the Presbyterian Church." This resolution led to the adoption of the plan of correspondence with the Congregational bodies of New England, which is still in existence, and according to which "every preacher travelling from one body to the other, and properly recommended, shall be received as an authorized preacher of the gospel, and cheerfully taken under the patronage of the presbytery or association, within whose limits he shall find employment as a preacher."

These conciliatory proceedings led to unexampled success in extending the Presbyterian Church, and in 1801 the General Assembly devised some new "regulations to promote harmony in the new settlements."

These regulations were proposed to the General Association of Connecticut, and met with their cordial concurrence. They may be found under the title of "A Plan of Union," &c., in the Assembly's Digest, p. 297, as follows, viz.:

"SEC. 5. A plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the new settlements, adopted in 1801.

"The report of the committee appointed to consider and digest a plan of government for the churches in the new settlements was taken up and considered; and after mature deliberation on the same, approved as follows:

"Regulations adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, and by the General Association of the State of Connecticut, (provided said Association agree to them,) with a view to prevent alienation, and promote union and harmony, in those new settlements which are composed of inhabitants from these bodies.

"1. It is strictly enjoined on all their missionaries to the new settlements, to endeavour, by all proper means, to promote mutual forbearance and accommodation, between those inhabitants of the new settlements, who hold the Presbyterian, and those who hold the Congregational form of church government.

"2. If in the new settlements, any church of the Congregational order shall settle a minister of the Presbyterian order, that church may, if they choose, still conduct their discipline according to Congregational principles, settling their difficulties among themselves, or by a council mutually agreed on for that purpose: but if any difficulty shall exist between the minister and the church, or any member of it,

it shall be referred to the presbytery to which the minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; if not, to a council consisting of equal numbers of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, agreed upon by both parties.

“3. If a Presbyterian church shall settle a minister of Congregational principles, that church may still conduct their discipline according to Presbyterian principles; excepting that if a difficulty arise between him and his church, or any member of it, the cause shall be tried by the association to which the said minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; otherwise by a council, one half Congregationalists and the other half Presbyterians, mutually agreed on by the parties.

“4. If any congregation consists partly of those who hold the Congregational form of discipline, and partly of those who hold the Presbyterian form, we recommend to both parties that this be no obstruction to their uniting in one church, and settling a minister: and that, in this case, the church choose a standing committee from the communicants of said church, whose business it shall be to call to account every member of the church who shall conduct himself inconsistently with the laws of Christianity, and give judgment on such conduct; and if the person condemned by their judgment be a Presbyterian, he shall have liberty to appeal to the presbytery; if a Congregationalist, he shall have liberty to appeal to the body of the male communicants of the church: in the former case the determination of the presbytery shall be final, unless the church consent to a further appeal to the synod, or to the General Assembly; and, in the latter case, if the party condemned shall wish for a trial by a mutual council, the cause shall be referred to such council. And provided that the said standing committee, of such church, shall depute one of themselves to attend the presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the presbytery as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church.

“On motion, resolved, that an attested copy of the above plan be made by the stated clerk, and put into the hands of the delegates of this Assembly to the General Association, to be by them laid before that body for their consideration; and that if it should be approved by them it go into immediate operation.”

This plan was acceded to by the General Association of Connecticut, and its practical working was remarkably harmonious for more than thirty years. During this period, the Presbyterian Church was extended with unexampled rapidity. “The Plan of Union” operated in forming churches of the mixed character contemplated by this

scheme. But the clergy were generally favourable to Presbyterian government; and as its representative feature agreed so well with the nature of our civil institutions, and secured all the substantial advantages of Congregationalism, the churches almost uniformly became Presbyterian in full, at no distant period from the date of their formation. In 1803, the Synod of Albany was constituted from the Presbyteries of Albany, Oneida, and Columbia. Through this synod the Plan of Union extended its united forces with the rolling flood of population over the beautiful regions of western New York. Within a few years the Presbyteries of Onondaga, Cayuga, and Geneva, were successively organized, constituting an extended western limb of the Synod of Albany.

The last named three presbyteries were then, by a division of the Synod of Albany constituted into the Synod of Geneva.

This body extended itself to the shores of Lake Erie and the Niagara river. In 1805, this extensive synod was divided by the General Assembly, and the Synod of Genesee was erected from the western portion. Thus the Synod of Albany, where the Plan of Union first begun to operate, became three large synods, including thirty-four presbyteries before 1837. Congregationalism was rapidly declining over all that region, and some whole presbyteries scarcely contained one church on the principles contemplated by the Plan of Union. This scheme for promoting harmony had accomplished the work for which it was designed; it had moulded the mixed mass into a comparatively homogeneous Presbyterian community. It was perhaps well that the Plan of Union should be abrogated. Presbyterianism was so thoroughly established, that no other consequences could well result from the change, except perhaps, the falling back of a few churches to pure Congregationalism.

Yet the very success of this plan became the occasion of separating the Presbyterian Church into two great bodies of nearly equal numerical force. But while the Plan of Union became the occasion of this rent, it was by no means the cause of it.

There were two parties in the church. There always had been from the time that McKemie and his associates formed the Presbytery of Philadelphia in 1705. The English Puritan and the Scotch elements that were commingled in the association formed in England between the Presbyterian and the Congregational denominations, were transplanted into America.

In this compound the Puritan influence was at first predominant. But a large share of the English immigration fell naturally into the Congregational Churches of New England, while nearly all the

Scotch as naturally dropped into the Presbyterian Church. Hence the Scotch element became more and more influential, as it came to bear a greater proportion to the whole body. Hence too the "old side" and the "new side," and the division of 1741. These parties possessed in their common symbols of faith, and in their common attachment to free non-prelatical principles, affinities of sufficient force to draw them together in some system of Christian co-operation. Yet there were differences, which like the repulsion existing between the particles of matter, when brought near to one another, resisted any thing like a complete coalescence.

The appellations "old side" and "new side," and "old school" and "new school," have been justly complained of as an arrogant claim for themselves on the part of those terming themselves "old school," and as evincing an attempt to cast odium upon their brethren as having less reverence for scriptural teaching, and the ancient paths of Christianity.

The terms Scotch party, and Puritan party, cannot be reasonably objected to, because each party glories in its own ancestry in this respect.

The differences of these two parties in their native characteristics, are pretty well understood. The Puritan is satisfied with maintaining the great leading truths of the Calvinistic faith, and is ready to waive minor differences, and to co-operate with all Christian people in diffusing evangelical piety. Hence, though the mass of our Puritan people preferred Congregational government, they looked calmly on, while hundreds of their ministers, and thousands of their church members were becoming thorough Presbyterians. The Scotch, on the contrary, were of a more inflexible character. They too loved Calvinistic doctrines, and if they had less zeal than the Puritans in diffusing our religion, and in acting for the regeneration of our country and the world, they were second to no other people on earth in these respects.

The differences in doctrine between the two had respect mainly to three points of explanation of great facts in the Calvinistic system. They both agreed that the whole race of Adam were sinners by nature. Many of the Scotch school maintained that sin was literally infused into the human soul prior to any moral agency of the subject.

Many of the Puritan party alleged that this was not the mode by which all men became sinners, but that it was enough to say that there were certain native propensities in every descendant of Adam, which naturally and certainly induced sinful action with the commencement of moral agency.

Many of the Scotch party maintained that the atonement of Christ is intended as a provision for the elect alone. The Puritan party asserted that the atonement is made for the race as a whole, so that it may be truly said to every lost sinner, after he shall be shut up in the eternal prison, "You might have had salvation; Christ purchased it for you, and proffered it to you in all sincerity."

The Scotch party maintained, that unconverted sinners were perfectly unable, in every sense, to comply with the requirements of the gospel. The other party alleged, that "God hath endued the will of man with that natural liberty, that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature, determined to good or evil." Many individuals were found, on both sides, that pushed these views to an extreme; but far the greater proportion of the clergy, in each party, were content to preach the gospel faithfully to their respective flocks, with so little of the controversial spirit, that the greater part of their intelligent hearers, did not understand that there was any perceptible difference in the theology of the two schools. Indeed, the division cannot be said to have taken place on theological principles.

Nor did the difference of measures for promoting religion exert any influence directly in producing the separation. The people of western New York were a staid New England population. When some irregularities sprung up among them, strong remonstrances were called into exercise in their own community, by this infringement of the uniform and long established order to which they had been accustomed. But, the same irregularities, that produced unhappy excitements there, are, at this day, exceeded, by far, in many portions of the Presbyterian Church, that have been wholly moulded by the Scotch party. We have known a church, in a village of western New York, thrown into great excitement, because a member was admitted to the communion of the church, with only one week's probation, after his first expressing a hope in Christ. This, too, when the man was a respectable citizen, a regular attendant upon the sanctuary, and of most blameless morals. Such were the habits of the Christian community, that great anxiety was created by what was there deemed so hasty a step in the reception of a convert to the ordinances of the church. Yet the writer of this article has witnessed in the state of Kentucky, under the Scotch system, an instance of a woman's coming to what was, untastefully enough, called an "anxious seat," on Saturday evening, indicating there and by that act, for the first time, that she was impressed with the great truths of the gospel; and yet she was received to the church the next day, without creating even surprise among the people.

This was not a new measure at the West, because the people were accustomed to it. It would probably be looked on as an act of hurried fanaticism in the most extravagant Presbyterian church in western New York, at the present day.

The causes of the division lay back of any serious differences in doctrines or measures. The Domestic Missionary Society, in New York, was a voluntary association, sending its missionaries to the new settlements of our western frontiers. The General Assembly also employed missionaries to labour upon the same field. Some friends of domestic missions in New England and New York, conceived of a noble project for increasing the efficiency of the domestic missionary movement.

It had been satisfactorily proved by the munificence of an individual, that the sum of one hundred dollars, given to a feeble congregation, would operate as an encouragement to the people, to secure a continuous dispensation of the gospel among them.

After some communications from one to another, among distinguished Christian philanthropists, the Domestic Missionary Society was merged in the American Home Missionary Society, formed in New York, in 1826. This society enjoyed a success which the missions of the General Assembly had never possessed.

The reasons were obvious. According to its plan of operations, every one hundred and sixty-two dollars, secured the planting of a missionary for one year, over a feeble church. Its funds were collected by soliciting from the benevolent considerable annual donations to its treasury. Many wealthy Christians contributed a sum sufficient to support one, two, three or more missionaries. On the plan of the Assembly, every missionary cost its mission four hundred and sixty-six dollars. Its collections, too, were mainly sought for in small sums. "The fifty cent plan," as it was termed, was greatly relied on.

This plan of soliciting from every member of the church, a penny a week, failed to secure any great amount of funds. The wealthy were pleased with a plan so agreeable to a parsimonious spirit; the solicitation was not universal, and great numbers failed to comply with a request so reasonable. Here was the germ of the difficulty. The Home Missionary Society extended its influence rapidly. The plan was popular. The results gave it increased eclat, and those who were connected with it, acquired a vast moral influence in the church. This influence was wielded mainly by those who were of the Puritan party. In Philadelphia, there was another kind of influence. It was ecclesiastical, and arose from that city's being the birthplace of American Presbyterianism, and the place where the

Général Assembly held its annual sessions. In that Jerusalem of our beloved church resided men venerated for their years, and respected for their learning, piety, and usefulness. They were of the Scotch party. "They were desirous," as Dr. Miller said of the ministers from Scotland, at another period, "to carry into effect the system to which they had been accustomed in all its extent and strictness." The Home Missionary Society, and the Plan of Union, promoted a rapid growth of the Puritan element in the Presbyterian Church. That portion of the church which had received its cast and tone from New England, possessed an efficiency in impressing its own character upon our growing population, which the Scotch party did not possess. It gave funds for the missionary work with far greater liberality; it educated men for the sacred office in greater numbers, it co-operated with other denominations more freely. It was the more popular and growing portion of the church, and it was evident that the day was not very distant, when it would have a strongly ascendant influence in the Presbyterian Church, unless something were done to check its power.

This naturally created anxiety in those who had been accustomed to a strong control in the ecclesiastical judicatories. They felt that the church would be unsafe, if the power should pass into other hands. Hence arose accusations for heresy against ministers whose reputation for orthodoxy never could be brought into question with any intelligent, uncommitted hearers of their preaching. Three distinguished prosecutions for heresy were instituted as a means of carrying out the designs of the Scotch party. These were the cases of the Rev. George Duffield, of Carlisle; the Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia; and the Rev. Lyman Beecher, D. D., of Cincinnati. These prosecutions were carried on with great zeal for several years; that of Mr. Barnes lasted six years; but all proved signal failures. There was a tone of moderation and piety in the church, which would not allow such men to be deposed as heretics.

These efforts were accompanied by a warm resistance of voluntary associations in the work of missions, and in educating young men for the sacred office; and also by a complaint of extravagance and new measures in the region where "the Plan of Union" had exerted its influence. It cannot be denied, indeed, that extravagances existed in western New York; but they were extravagances of which the other party had no right to complain, and of which they would probably never have heard, if the Puritan party had been as much accustomed to camp meetings, and anxious seats, and hasty admissions, as

extensive regions of the church under the control of the Scotch party had been.

The Scotch party was doubtless sincere in magnifying every cause for apprehension in regard to the doctrines, and the order of the other portion of the church. Good men accustomed to great influence very easily believe, that if power passes from their own hands, it will be exercised with less discretion.

The moderate party had the advantage in point of numbers; but they had less of *esprit du corps*, less of organization as a party, and less disposition to contend. The Scotch party organized themselves by conventions and appeals through the press, representing the church as being in extreme danger from heresy in doctrine, and innovations upon established order. The feelings to which they appealed were a warm regard for Presbyterian order and doctrine. The Puritan party really believed that it was unjustifiable to attempt to meet these war-like preparations by demonstrations of the same character. They thought, if they still devoted their energies to the cause of missions, and the progress of piety in our own church, and in the country at large, God would protect their cause.

The General Assembly of 1837, convened in Philadelphia. It was distinctly understood, previously to the meeting, through a convention of that party, that if they could secure a majority, some measures would be adopted which would disable, ever thereafter, the moderate party in the church. The desired majority was obtained. They first abrogated the Plan of Union, and then declared four synods, viz.: those of Utica, Geneva, Genesee, and the Western Reserve, out of the Presbyterian Church. The "Plan of Union" did not make these four synods, it only made the people Presbyterians, and the General Assembly constituted the synods. When "The Plan of Union" was abrogated, it became obvious that those churches, which were partly or wholly Congregational, must lose their connexion with the presbyteries; but how synods and presbyteries lost their Presbyterian character by the removal of what little remnants of Congregationalism had remained in them till that time, it is difficult to conceive. Indeed it is quite manifest that the whole movement was made, as was admitted by a principal leader of the party at the time, for the simple purpose of preventing a future majority of the other party. These four synods, comprising about five hundred ministers, and six hundred churches, and sixty thousand communicants, were attempted to be cut off from the Presbyterian Church, because, if the opposing party was not thoroughly broken by such an excision, the Scotch party would never have a majority on that floor again.

After passing these resolutions, the majority took effective measures to retain the records, and the funds of the church, by passing an order requiring the clerks to pledge themselves not to receive the commissioners from the excscinded synods, in the formation of the next Assembly.

The Puritan party learning that if the moderator and clerks should assume to carry out the unconstitutional acts of 1837, in the organizing of the Assembly of 1838, it would be clearly a conspiracy to deprive them of their rights, appeared by their commissioners and organized the Assembly, at the appointed time and place, in a legal and constitutional manner. The Scotch party also organized, and each body proclaimed itself the regular constitutional "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America." The party that had excscinded the four synods to secure to themselves a future majority, retained all the funds and property of the church, amounting to more than three hundred thousand dollars.

The General Assembly in its session in 1838, appointed six new trustees, in accordance with the act of corporation, passed by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, in 1799. The new trustees thus appointed, instituted a process in law, requiring of the trustees who had been superseded "To answer to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by what warrant they claimed to have, use, and enjoy the franchises and privileges of Trustees of the General Assembly."

After a full and impartial trial before a jury, a verdict was rendered in favour of the plaintiffs—the Puritan party: "that is," as explained by the presiding judge, "the Assembly which held its sittings in the First Presbyterian Church, (a portion of which had been cut off in 1837, without trial,) was the true General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America, under the charter."

The counsel for the defendants applied to "the Supreme Court in Banc" for a new trial. After hearing the cause, Chief Justice Gibson ordered a new trial. Various delays occurred. The General Assembly is satisfied with the moral effect of the decision rendered by a jury of their countrymen, and has withdrawn the suit.

The reasons for this withdrawment are various. First, the General Assembly is willing to sacrifice something, and even much, for peace. But the great object of the trial has been secured. The Constitutional party definitely offered to leave all the funds in the hands of the excscinding party, if they would allow the separation to be a *division* of the church rather than an expulsion of nearly one third part of the whole, so that its church property should not be at the mercy of the

excisers, whenever even a small minority might see fit to rise up and claim it from those who had produced it to secure to themselves and their children the ordinances of the gospel. This they utterly refused. The Assembly preferred to secure the right to the churches which they had built, by testing their right to be considered the lawful successors, according to the charter. The result is known. An enlightened court and jury, before whom the merits of the cause on both sides were fully and ably manifested—THE ONLY TRIBUNAL WHERE THE CAUSE EVER WAS TRIED UPON ITS MERITS—were prompt and unanimous in our favour. After the new trial was ordered, several suits were commenced, by small minorities attempting to take, by course of law, the sanctuaries which our people had erected before the division. Every one of these cases that came to an issue was decided in our favour.

The award of the Court in Banc, Chief Justice Gibson presiding and pronouncing the opinion of the court, in the case of the Presbyterian Church of York, Pennsylvania, while it has for ever settled the occupancy of church property in that State on the proper basis, has so clearly treated of the main questions at issue, between the parties in the action we have withdrawn, and so correctly in the main has it eclaireised and settled them, that we are comparatively content with the award, inasmuch as IT EXPLAINS, QUALIFIES, AND IN EFFECT MORALLY OVERRULES, THE POSITIONS BEFORE ADVANCED, by the same court, on the motion previously "affirmed absolute," for a new trial.

In that award, allusion is distinctly had to those positions, as leading to the absolute affirmance of the motion; and this result is explained as follows: "It was not because the minority were thought to be any thing else than Presbyterians, but because a popular body is known only by its government or head. * * * Indeed, the measure [the ex-scinding violence] would seem to have been as decisively revolutionary, as would be an exclusion of particular States from the Federal Union, for the adoption of an anti-republican form of government. * * * * * That the Old School party acceded to the privileges and property of the Assembly, was not because it was more Presbyterian than the other, but because it was stronger; for had it been the weaker, it would have been the party excluded."

The Scotch party retain the funds and property. Individuals of the party have intimated a willingness to restore as much of these funds as was contributed by the Puritan party. There is no doubt they would be more happy if it were done; but how to perform that which they desire, they find not. The funds are of little consequence. The period of deep excitement has passed away. Some great advan-

tages have accrued from this unhappy division of brethren. The accusations of heresy have ceased, and events have shown that either party would gladly strengthen itself with receiving to its arms any clergyman of good standing in his present position. An interchange of public service in one another's churches has already commenced, and there is every reason to hope that the time is not distant, when the kindest and most fraternal intercourse will prevail universally between these two branches of the Presbyterian family.

Names are of minor consequence; yet they exert an influence; and the present relations of these two bodies demand the exercise of Christian courtesy and kindness in the appellations by which they shall distinguish one another. The General Assembly of the Puritan party has been termed the Constitutional General Assembly, to distinguish it from those of the excising body, and this has been justified on the ground that the jury so decided. But it is to be remembered that a final decision has not been had, and it is adapted to wound the feelings of some to fix such appellations upon the two parties. They are now two churches. The division may be advantageously contemplated as one of the events ordered by an all-wise Providence.

The Assembly of the Scotch party holds its sessions annually. That of the Puritan party meets only once in three years. There can be no offence in calling one the Annual Assembly, and the other the Triennial Assembly.

The numerical strength of the two churches is not greatly unequal. The Triennial Assembly carries forward its charitable operations wholly by means of voluntary associations, in which it co-operates with other denominations. Its contributions to foreign missions are made chiefly to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; those for our own country are through the American Home Missionary Society. It has no denominational tract society, preferring to act with its Christian brethren of other churches in the American Tract Society. The church has raised up, and has now under its care, four theological seminaries, viz.: those of Auburn, New York, and Lane Seminary, at Cincinnati, and the Theological Seminary of Maryville, East Tennessee, together with a theological department in the Western Reserve College,—and all in a highly flourishing condition. In respect to colleges and institutions of secular learning generally, the Presbyterian Church prefers to act with all its countrymen, without respect to denominations, any further than to secure in such institutions a proper regard for sound morals and true religion. Associated naturally with the population of New England, the difference of forms of ecclesiastical polity cannot prevent a

natural co-operation with the sons of the Pilgrims, in disseminating Christianity with less of exclusiveness and sectarian character than belongs to any other body of Christians.

It remains to be seen whether there is sufficient of liberality and charity in the age to justify such a procedure, or whether this generosity of the Presbyterian Church shall be met with such an amount of exclusiveness, as to receive an impulse while imparting one, and thus to become assimilated in this respect to the sects by which it is surrounded.

The General Assembly has under its care 19 synods, 101 presbyteries, and nearly 1500 ministers.

In concluding this statement it may not be improper to remark, that when other denominations have been alluded to, it has been done for the sake of setting forth distinctly the character and position of the Presbyterian Church. Not a wish has been indulged to wound the feelings of other communions. The prelatical churches, from which we differ so widely on the great principles of ecclesiastical liberty, we nevertheless regard as churches of Christ, and would as cordially invite them to our pulpits and our communion, if they would reciprocate our kindness, as we do the clergy and communicants of other denominations, and we feel even an unaffected grief that they should be prevented by their system from meeting us as the ministers of Christ, and members of the Church Universal. We would gladly have passed over all allusion to the division of our own church in 1838; but it seemed otherwise impossible to make a fair statement of the characteristics and condition of the Presbyterian Church. We have aimed to avoid all offence in speaking of the parties as leaning respectively towards the strictness of the Scotch Church, and the readier tendency to yield and to assimilate with others manifested by the descendants of the English Puritans. It cannot be denied, that many Presbyterians originally of the Scotch school, both clergy and laity, as the Synod of Virginia and others, are among our most liberal constitutional Presbyterians, nor that some of the clergy and people born and educated among the Pilgrim sons of New England, are among the straitest class of those connected with the church of the Annual Assembly. We only mean a general characteristic of the parties as such, when we give them these appellations. With that church the writer, as an individual—and he is confident the same may be said of most of his brethren—has no personal difficulties. He has been for a term of five years together connected with a presbytery, in which nearly every member sympathized with that party. The kindly intercourse enjoyed with his brethren of Louisiana will not be

easily forgotten. If we have spoken of our own church as the true constitutional Presbyterian Church, it was not to question the rights of others. It was only because we really think it such. Undoubtedly others think differently with equal sincerity. Our prayer is that both may prosper, and only provoke one another to love and good works, and that all those churches who hold Christ the head may unite their energies against all those forms of sin that resist the progress of our common Christianity.

In preparing the above article, thoughts and language have been taken from such sources of information as were accessible to us. In doing this it was less trouble and more favourable to typographical beauty, and to rendering the whole readable, to avoid frequent quotation marks and notes in the margin. Acknowledgments are due to the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Directory of the Presbyterian Church; The Assembly's Digest; Dr. Hill's and Dr. Hodge's Histories of the Presbyterian Church; Dr. Miller's Tract on Presbyterianism, and his article on the same subject in the Religious Encyclopædia; Judge Rogers' Charge to the Jury on the trial of the Church case; Letter of the Committee ad interim of the General Assembly, and the Decision of Chief Justice Gibson in the case of the Church of York, Pennsylvania.

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

BY THE REV. JOHN N. M'LEOD, D.D.,
NEW YORK.

THE Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States of America derives her origin from the old Reformation Church of Scotland. Her history, therefore, down to the period of her organization in this country, is necessarily involved in that of the parent church herself. It deserves remembrance to her honour, that Scotland was among the last of the nations to submit to the usurpation of the Church of Rome. Until the beginning of the eleventh century she possessed a Christian church which maintained her spiritual independence, and refused to bow to the Papal supremacy. But Antichrist at length prevailed, and substituted his ruinous formalism for the ancient Christianity. From the beginning of the eleventh to that of the sixteenth century, "darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people" of insular as well as continental Europe.

With the sixteenth century, however, commenced that glorious revival of evangelical religion, the Protestant Reformation. Scotland felt its influence, and awoke from her slumber. John Knox of famous memory, had lighted his torch at the candle of God's word, which had just been rescued from under the bushel where Antichrist had hidden it for ages. He carried it through his native land, and her nobles, her people, and many even of the priests of Rome, were enlightened in the truths of the gospel. In the year 1560 Popery was abolished; the Bible was declared free to all; a Confession of Faith, containing an admirable summary of divine truth, was prepared; a book of discipline, declaring the government of the church to be presbyterial, was adopted; and all ranks of men in the nation bound themselves to each other and to God, in a solemn covenant engagement, to maintain and perpetuate the Reformation which had been established. This is what is usually denominated in Scottish history the "first reformation," or reformation from Popery. And thus arose

the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*. For more than thirty years after this period, the church enjoyed great temporal and spiritual prosperity. But from the year 1592 to 1688, her history, with the exception of a twelve years' interval of rest and triumph, is one of warfare and suffering. Her most powerful enemies were unprincipled civilians. They sought to make her a mere engine of state policy, an instrument of their own despotism; and when she would not submit, they attempted to coërcé her by the sword. During the greater part of the reigns of James VI., and his son and grandson, the first and second Charles, the Reformed Presbyterian Church was struggling for existence against the power of the state, which assumed an antichristian supremacy over her, and proceeded to dictate to her the doctrine, worship, and order she should receive and observe under pain of imprisonment, banishment, and death.

Adversity tests the character of systems as well as of men; and never was the worth of the Reformed Presbyterian system more signally manifested, than during the period the church was in the furnace of affliction. Thousands maintained her principles in the face of the persecutor. The life and power of godliness was most remarkably displayed, and multitudes of holy martyrs sealed with their blood the testimony which they held.

Of the interval of relief to which reference has already been had, it is sufficient to say, that it was the period between 1638 and 1650: the era of the Solemn League and Covenant; of the Westminster Assembly of divines; of the revolution which dethroned the first Charles, and asserted those principles of civil and religious liberty which all enlightened Christians and statesmen now regard as axiomatic and undeniable. This is the period of what is usually styled the "second reformation," and it was for a strict adherence to its principles that Cameron and Renwick, and their valiant coadjutors, were called to pour out their blood on the high places of the field. To these principles, as of universal importance and applicability, Reformed Presbyterians still avow their attachment.

In the year 1688, William of Nassau was called to the throne of the three kingdoms. He proceeded, among the first acts of his reign, to give a civil establishment to religion in his dominions. Episcopacy was established in England and Ireland, and Presbytery in Scotland, by the sole authority of the king and parliament, even before the assembly of the church was permitted to meet. And thus the old principle of the *royal supremacy* over the church was retained, and incorporated with the very vitals of the revolution settlement. The object of the civil rulers was, as usual, to make the church a tool of

the State. Into an establishment of this description the old consistent Covenanters could not go. They stood aloof and dissented from it as imperfect, Erastian, and immoral. The principal objections which they urged against incorporation with the revolution settlement, were: 1st. That the Solemn League and Covenant, which they considered the constitution of the empire, was entirely disregarded in its arrangements,—and 2d. That the civil rulers usurped an authority over the church, which virtually destroyed her spiritual independence, and was at variance with the sole headship of the Redeemer himself. The world has just witnessed the spectacle of the large majority of the Scottish establishment becoming “dissenters” on this very ground: a testimony that the old Reformed Presbyterians were right. For more than sixteen years they remained without a ministry; but they were not discouraged. Though a small minority, they organized themselves into praying societies, in which they statedly met for religious worship. They exercised a watchful care over the moral and religious deportment of each other. They fostered the spirit of attachment to Reformation principles, and waited until God would send them pastors. And at length they were gratified. In the year 1706, the Rev. John McMillan acceded to them from the established church. In 1743 he was joined by the Rev. Mr. Nairne, from the Secession Church, which had been recently organized, and they with ruling elders constituted the “Reformed Presbytery.” Through this, as the line of their connexion with the ancient church, the Reformed Presbyterians in this country received their present ministry. They had, however, a ministry as well as a people in the North American colonies, before the Reformed Presbytery in Scotland was organized by the Rev. Mr. McMillan and his coadjutors.

In the same series of persecutions which drove the Huguenots of France and the Puritans of England to these shores, many of the Scottish and Irish Reformed Presbyterians, were banished from their native lands, and scattered among the American colonies. In crossing the ocean and changing their habitation, they had not changed their religious attachments. And when first visited by the ministers who came to their aid, they were found with their children collected into praying societies, and fostering with care the principles of civil and religious freedom, for which they and their ancestors had suffered. Though the name Covenanter, like that of Puritan, was given them by way of reproach, they did not refuse it. Esteeming it their honour to be in covenant with God and with one another, to do their whole duty, they accepted the designation, and even attempted in a public manner, to practise the thing which it indicates. In the year

1743, aided by the Rev. Mr. Craighead, who had acceded to them from a synod of Presbyterians organized a few years before, the Covenanters in the colony of Pennsylvania, proceeded to enter into a solemn public engagement to abide by and maintain their principles. This transaction served to promote union among themselves, and to keep them distinct from the other religious societies which were forming around them.

The Reformed Presbyterian has ever been a missionary church. The presbyteries of that name in Scotland and Ireland saw the promising field beyond the ocean, and hearkening to the Macedonian cry that came from their brethren there, they sent them the aid they desired. In 1752 the Rev. Mr. Cuthbertson arrived in America from the Reformed Presbytery of Scotland. He served the church alone for nearly twenty years, and was greatly instrumental both in promoting the piety of those among whom he laboured, and fostering the spirit of opposition to British tyranny, which ultimately demanded and secured the independence of these United States. Being joined by Messrs. Linn and Dobbin from the Reformed Presbytery of Ireland, in 1774 a presbytery was constituted, and the church took her stand as a distinct visible community in the North American colonies.

In the year 1776 the declaration of American independence took place. It was hailed with joy by Reformed Presbyterians. They were opponents of the British government from both principle and feeling, and in proportion to their numbers they contributed largely to the success of the Revolution. They took an active part in the war. Some of them were members of the conventions which established the States' constitutions, and subsequently of their legislatures; and although they saw defects in the new government, they cordially recognised it as legitimate, and deserving of their conscientious support.

The visible unity of the Church of God is a fundamental principle of the Presbyterian system. The revolutionary and transition state of society for some time before the establishment of American independence, occasioned a neglect of this principle, and kept the church in a divided and inefficient condition. But on the settlement of a stable civil government by the American people, the minds of many in the different churches were turned to the subject of union. A union of the whole Presbyterian family on a basis of truth and order adapted to the age, country, and circumstances of the church in the American republic, was very extensively desired, and various attempts were made to secure it. The time, however, for this did not seem to have arrived. The results of the overtures for union in some in-

stances were plans of correspondence and co-operation more or less extensive, and the nearest approach to the great object sought, was that union of formerly distinct bodies which gave origin to the Associate Reformed Church. This took place in the year 1782, between the presbyteries of the Associate and Reformed Churches. The united body took the names of its two constituent parts, and hence arose the "Associate Reformed Church in the United States."

A portion of the Associate Church, however, and one minister, with a large number of the people of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, did not approve of the union, or enter into it when consummated. And thus both these bodies, though diminished in numbers, retained their distinctive standings.

Within ten years after this event, four ministers emigrated from Europe, to aid in maintaining the Reformed Presbyterian cause. They were the Rev. James Reid, from Scotland, who returned to his own country when his missionary tour was accomplished, and Messrs. McGarragh, King, and McKinney, the latter of whom arrived in the year 1793.

The Rev. Messrs. Martin, King, and McGarragh, regulated the affairs of the church as a committee of the Reformed Presbytery in Scotland. But this was a mere temporary expedient, and its object having been answered, Messrs. McKinney, King, and Gibson, who had recently emigrated from Ireland, proceeded to constitute a Presbyterial judicatory independent of all foreign control. Mr. King did not live to meet his brethren at the time appointed, and in 1798, the Rev. Messrs. McKinney and Gibson, with ruling elders, proceeded to constitute the "*Reformed Presbytery of the United States of North America.*" Thus the church took her stand on American ground. Her relations to the Reformed Presbyterians of the Old World, as there defined and since existing, are those of an independent sister church. And in proceeding to arrange her terms of communion, she at once declared that she adopted the Reformed Presbyterian system, only in so far as it presents common truth, and "binds to duties not peculiar to the church in the British Isles, but common in all lands." It was thus her determination to rear, not an exotic of foreign growth and culture, but a plant which would be at home on American soil, and furnish abundant fruit unto eternal life.

Soon after the organization of the presbytery, Rev. Drs. Wylie, Black, the late Dr. Alexander McLeod, and Rev. Mr. Donnelly, were licensed to preach the gospel. They became efficient missionaries through the United States; the cause prospered in their hands; and in the year 1808, a synod composed of three presbyteries, was consti-

tuted, under the name of the "Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States of North America." In the year 1825 the supreme judicatory received the form of a representative assembly, composed of delegates from presbyteries, and styled the "General Synod:" under this organization the church now exists.

Of the *principles* of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, it may be sufficient to say generally, that as to *doctrine* they are strictly *Calvinistic*; and as to *church government and order of worship*, *Presbyterian*. Her ecclesiastical standards subordinate to the word of God, are the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and her Declaration and Testimony, third edition, 1843. In declaring her approbation of the Westminster Confession of Faith, she makes the following disclaimer: "To prevent all misunderstanding of the matter of the second article of this formula, which embraces the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, it is declared in reference to the power of the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical things, that it is not now, and never was, any part of the faith of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, that the civil magistrate is authorized to interfere with the Church of God, in the assertion, settlement, or administration of her doctrine, worship, and order; or to assume any dominion over the rights of conscience. All that appertains to the magistratical power in reference to the church, is the protection of her members in the full possession, exercise and enjoyment of their rights. The magistratical office is civil and political, and consequently altogether exterior to the church."

Reformed Presbyterians have been regarded as entertaining certain *peculiar* opinions on the subjects of slavery, psalmody, communion, civil government, and covenanting. It is proper that these should be understood. With regard to *slavery*, the principle which they hold is, that the purchase, sale, or retention of unoffending men of any part of the human family as slaves, is a moral evil against which the Church of God should bear a pointed and active testimony. And in carrying this principle into practice, it was enacted by the highest judicatory of the church in the year 1800, and when a large proportion of her members resided in the South, that no slaveholder should be retained in the communion of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. Upon this principle she still continues to act.

On the subject of *psalmody*, the sentiments of the church are thus expressed in the eighth article of her Testimony, under the head of "Christian Worship:"—"Singing God's praise is a part of public social worship, in which the whole congregation should join; the book of Psalms, which are of divine inspiration, is well adapted to the state of the church, and of every member, in all ages and circumstances;

and these Psalms, to the exclusion of all imitations and uninspired compositions, are to be used in social worship."

The Reformed Presbyterian Church has never insisted on the use of any particular version of the book of Psalms, any further than that such version was preferable to all others. Her principle is, that the matter of the church's praise should be exclusively the songs of inspiration, in the best attainable translation.

On the subject of *sacramental communion* the principles of the church are, that such communion is the most solemn, intimate and perfect fellowship that Christians can enjoy with God and one another; that when Christians are associated together in a church state under a definite creed, communion in the sacraments involves an approbation of the principles of that creed; and that as the church is invested with authority, which she is bound to exercise, to keep the ordinances of God pure and entire: sacramental communion is not to be extended to those who do not approve the principles of the particular church or submit themselves to her authority. In maintaining these principles the Reformed Presbyterian Church does not design to unchurch any other religious denomination, or deny the Christianity of its members. She recognises the validity of the ordinances of all Christian communities who hold the divine Head, and the plenary inspiration of his word. She rejoices to know that these contain many of the saints of God, who have fellowship with him and with one another at the table of the Lord, and she is willing to co-operate with them to the extent of her ability, in promoting the common Christianity. But she does not feel at liberty to allow every man to be the judge of his own qualification for sealing ordinances, to dispense these ordinances to such as do not assent to her religious principles, or whom she could not submit to her discipline were they found violating their Christian obligations.

On the subject of *civil government*, the Reformed Presbyterian Church expressly testifies against a sentiment that has sometimes been attributed to her, "that civil government is founded in grace." And she affirms, "that civil society, together with its order, has its foundation in the natural constitution of man, and his external relationships in life; that it was instituted by the Creator and Ruler of the world immediately for the good of man, and ultimately for the divine glory; and that the principles of God's moral law are the supreme standard according to which human society is obliged to regulate and conduct its affairs." And again, "that though civil society and its governmental institutions are not founded in grace: yet it is the duty of Christians to endeavour to bring over civil states

the influence of the grace of the gospel, and to persuade such states to put themselves in subordination to Immanuel, for the protection and furtherance of the interests of religion and liberty." And again, in applying these principles to the constitution and government of the United States, she further declares, "that in a land where peculiar religious characteristics have never been extensively introduced into civil deeds of constitution; where there is no apostacy from established and sworn to reformation; where the constitutional evils complained of are simply omissions, not fundamental to the existence and essential operations of civil society; where no immoral engagement is required, and no pledge either demanded or given to approve of or perpetuate defects; where fundamental principles of the social state, moral in their nature, are adopted; where a testimony against defects is admitted, and the way left open, constitutionally, to employ all moral means to obtain a remedying of defects: the same obstacles stand not in the way of a Christian's entrance into civil communion, as do in a land where, such religious characteristics having been adopted, covenanted, and sworn to, but, having been departed from, upon the ruins of a reformed system, one of an opposite character has been introduced. And further, that under a testimony against defects, circumstanced as above stated, the Christian may consistently enter into the civil fellowship of the country where he resides, using his liberty on a moral basis to seek the improvement of the social state." And again, the church has declared, "that the acts and legislation of this church have at all times authorized all connexion with the civil society and institutions of the United States, which does not involve immorality."

The position, then, which the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States is understood to occupy towards the government of the country, is simply this, believing that a representative democracy is the ordinance of God, she approves of its republican form and character. She perceives no moral evil in its constitution. She finds it promoting the best interests of the citizen, and throwing the shield of its protection over the Church of Jesus Christ; and therefore she leaves her members at liberty to incorporate with it by becoming its citizens and assuming its offices, if they can do so in consistency with their own conscientious convictions. But she insists that no immoral man should be invested with office; that the Bible is the rule of official administration as well as private conduct; and that civil rulers, in common with all other characters, are responsible to Jesus Christ as the "Prince of the kings of the earth, and Governor among the nations."

Some Reformed Presbyterians have, from time to time, entertained the opinion that the constitution and government of the United States is essentially infidel and immoral, and that therefore they should be dissenters from both. And, principally on the ground of maintaining this opinion, in the year 1833, a number of ministers with adherents seceded from the General Synod of the church, and formed a separate organization. But the position of the church is as above stated. (See "Testimony," second and third editions, and "Proceedings of Synod," Pittsburg, August, 1835.)

On the subject of *covenanting*, from the prominence given to which in their systems, Reformed Presbyterians have often been called "Covenanters," the following requisition is made in the fourth article of their Terms of Communion:—"An acknowledgment that public social covenanting, upon proper occasions, is an ordinance of God; and that such moral deeds as respect the future, whether ecclesiastical or civil, are of continued obligation, as well upon those who are represented in the taking of them, as upon those who actually covenant, until the ends of them be effected."

In common with other Christians, Reformed Presbyterians believe that every individual believer is in covenant with God for himself personally, and that the Church of God is a covenant society, whose members are solemnly engaged to God, and one another, to do their whole duty. But in addition to this, it is their sentiment that, on special occasions of commanding importance—such as a time of great and threatened danger to the interests of church and state, or of attempted extensive reformation in the church—men may and ought, both as individuals and by communities, to *combine* together, and mutually *pledge* themselves, under the *solemnity of an oath* to God and one another, to sustain the right and oppose the wrong, in both civil and religious things. When such solemn pledge respects the future, it is binding on the individual or community which gives it, until its whole object be accomplished. Passing by the many instances of public social covenanting which occur in the history of the Hebrews under the Old Testament, an exemplification of the principle is presented in the famous League of Smalkalde, formed by the Lutherans in 1530, when they pledged themselves to one another and to God to maintain and defend the Reformed religion against all its enemies. And there is another still more perfect and remarkable in the Solemn League and Covenant, in which the friends of civil and religious liberty combined their energies to protect and secure the dearest interests of humanity against the civil despot and religious persecutor. Society, at the time it was formed, was in a revolu-

tionary condition. In the state, absolute anarchy seemed about to take the place of the civil despotism, which had for some time prevailed; and the very existence of the Protestant religion in the British empire was threatened. In this emergency the friends of liberty and truth had recourse to *God's ordinance of public social covenanting*, for relief and encouragement. They committed themselves to God, and to one another by the will of God. Under the shield of the Solemn League and Covenant, the Assembly of Divines at Westminster sat, and prepared the Confession of Faith and Catechisms for the world. It furnished the rallying point for the best friends of religion and liberty while England was in anarchy, and Scotland in the grasp of the persecutor; and in its spirit many of the English Puritans and Scottish and Irish Reformed Presbyterians emigrated to America, and gave their aid in making our country what it is. American Reformed Presbyterians approve of the great principle of *combination for good under the oath of God*, which this transaction illustrates, and hold themselves in readiness, when the exigencies of the times may demand, to exemplify it themselves as the age, country, and special circumstances of their condition require.

Reformed Presbyterians are scattered over the Middle and Western States, and have a few congregations in the South. Their ministers possess much of the missionary spirit, and spend a considerable portion of their time in preaching the gospel to the destitute of all descriptions, beyond the bounds of their own immediate congregations. The practice of expository preaching prevails universally among them; they will be found "lecturing," as it is styled, over entire books of the Bible, as a stated part of the service of the Sabbath; and as errors and delusions arise, and are propagated in society, they are among the first to enter into an examination of them, and utter the warning against them. The ministry of the Reformed Presbyterian Church has always had among its members men eminent for talent, learning, and public spirit, who in proportion to their number, have had a large share of the literary labours, and honours of the country. Among the people, meetings for prayer and Christian conference, weekly and monthly, are statedly observed. Family worship, and attention to the moral and religious instruction of the youth, as well as a personal deportment becoming the gospel, are required of them as qualifications for sacramental privileges. They have but few endowments for religious or benevolent purposes, but are liberal in the support of the gospel, both at home and abroad. It is left to others to speak of the religious character, of both ministers and people. But it may be said in gratitude to the God of all grace,

that he has not left them without a witness of his presence and approbation; but that from year to year he has given them the assurance, that he is employing their instrumentality as a distinct religious community, for the maintenance of his truth, the conversion of sinners to Jesus Christ, and the preparation of many saints for the celestial glory.

The Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States is under the direction of a General Synod, composed of six presbyteries, one of which is established among the heathen in Northern India. And she numbers at present twenty-four ordained ministers, five licentiates, eight students of theology, forty-four organized congregations, and about four thousand five hundred communicants.

RESTORATIONISTS.

BY THE HON. CHAS. HUDSON, M. C.

RESTORATIONISTS believe that all men will ultimately become holy and happy. They maintain that God created only to bless; and that, in pursuance of this purpose, he sent his Son to "be for salvation to the ends of the earth;" that Christ's kingdom is moral in its nature, and extends to moral beings in every state or mode of existence; that the probation of man is not confined to the present life, but extends through the mediatorial reign; and that, as Christ died for all, so, before he shall have delivered up the kingdom to the Father, all shall be brought to a participation of the knowledge and enjoyment of that truth, which maketh free from the bondage of sin and death. They believe in a general resurrection and judgment, when those who have improved their probation in this life will be raised to more perfect felicity, and those who have misimproved their opportunities on earth will come forward to shame and condemnation, which will continue till they become truly penitent; that punishment itself is a mediatorial work, a discipline, perfectly consistent with mercy; that it is a means employed by Christ to humble and subdue the stubborn will, and prepare the mind to receive a manifestation of the goodness of God, which leadeth the sinner to true repentance.*

That God was the rightful sovereign of the universe is a truth which no one will deny; and that he had a moral as well as a natural government, will be conceded by every believer in divine revelation. But man, the subject of this moral government, rebelled against Heaven, and set the laws of his Maker at defiance. In this defection, which was moral in its character, the whole world was involved. They had all gone out of the way; there was none good, no not one. Now it was to heal this moral defection, to subdue this rebel universe, and to bring all to true allegiance, that the kingdom of Christ was instituted. This lets us at once into the nature and extent of the Redeemer's kingdom, and shows most clearly the object of his reign.

* *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge.*

The defection was universal. It reached back to the commencement of time, and onward to the consummation of all things. It consisted in an alienation of heart and a perverseness of mind. It was, in a word, a moral epidemic, affecting every individual of our race. Such was the nature and extent of the disease; and the cure must be correspondent. Christ's kingdom, then, is moral in its nature, and universal in its extent. It is not an empire over matter, but over mind. He was placed at the head of this kingdom, not to exercise mere physical power, and thus subdue sinners by brute force; not to operate upon men mechanically, and by the application of natural laws to restrain their outward actions. No; he was invested with regal authority, that he might by the employment of moral means subdue the evil propensities, and implant virtuous affections in the heart—that he might induce men to return to their allegiance, become reconciled to God, and own him as their lawful sovereign. His kingdom is purely moral—the rod of his empire is persuasion, and the sword he wields is the sword of the Spirit. By an exhibition of his Father's love, by a display of the joys of heaven, by kind entreaty and stern rebuke, by promises and threatenings—by these, and means such as these, he assails a rebel universe. With such weapons he will subdue our unregenerate hearts, and re-establish the reign of righteousness throughout the vast empire of the King Eternal.

The nature, design, and extent of Christ's kingdom involve each other. His kingdom being moral, must apply to every moral being. Being clothed with authority to put down rebellion, it must extend to as many as have rebelled. Being sent to heal the leprosy of sin, the healing medicine must be applied to as many as are diseased. No reason can be assigned for the establishment of this reign, which will not apply equally to every individual of our race. Did it flow from the love of God? That love is universal, and embraces the whole intelligent creation. Was it to bring men to their rightful Sovereign? All were estranged from God by wicked works, and needed alike this reconciliation. Was it to subdue rebellion, so that the laws of God might be obeyed, and his character respected? Our whole species had revolted from heaven, and were alike in opposition to the reign of God. Every reason therefore which can be assigned for the establishment of the mediatorial kingdom, shows that that kingdom includes the whole offspring of Adam.

There is another consideration which proves beyond a doubt the universality of the Redeemer's kingdom. The very idea of a kingdom supposes laws, and these laws are binding upon all the subjects. No sovereign, how great soever may be his power, or extensive his do-

minion, has a right to command the obedience of a single individual who is not a subject of his kingdom. The Czar of Russia, potent as he is, and absolute as his power may be, has no right to extend his laws a single inch beyond his dominion. Wherever you limit his kingdom, you limit his right to command obedience. And the same principle applies to the divine government. Jehovah himself in the plenitude of his power, has no moral right to extend his authority beyond his own kingdom. His right to command obedience is unlimited, simply because his kingdom has no bounds. If you could limit the one you would at the same time limit the other. To whom then does Christ address his laws? Who are under obligation to obey those moral precepts which flowed from the lips of the dear Redeemer? The true answer to this question determines the extent of his kingdom. And surely there can be no dispute on this subject. Every enlightened Christian will allow that his precepts are universally binding; that every human being, from our first progenitor down to his latest descendants, is under obligation to obey all known gospel requisitions, and ascribe glory to God and the Lamb. This settles the question in the most satisfactory manner, and proves beyond controversy that the kingdom of Christ is universal.

From this view of the subject it appears that the kingdom of Christ is moral or spiritual in its nature, unlimited in its extent, and benevolent in its design; that it was instituted by God to put down rebellion, and to bring all his creatures to the worship and enjoyment of himself. Do you ask from what scriptures we prove these positions? we answer, from the whole Bible. They are the fundamental principles of divine revelation. That all have sinned, and that Christ came to save sinners, is the summary of the Old Testament and the compendium of the New. The very existence of the Christian scriptures shows that Christ came to save sinners, and reconcile to God a world lying in wickedness. The Gospels prove it without the Epistles, and the Epistles without the Gospels. You may expunge from the New Testament any verse you please, any chapter you please, or any book you please, and the residue will clearly sustain these positions. Nay, you may expunge from the New Testament any five books you please, and you leave the positions we have stated untouched. They are deeply interwoven with the whole New Testament. They constitute the bones and sinews, the letter and spirit, the life and soul of the Christian scriptures. Take from the New Testament the important facts that Christ came to save sinners, that his kingdom is moral in its nature, and extends over all, and you sap the foundation of the gospel—you extract the life-blood of the living oracles of God.

We do not rely upon particular texts, so much, as upon the pervading spirit of the Bible. We draw our conclusions from the whole rather than from a part. One argument of this character will outweigh a hundred arguments founded on particular passages or isolated expressions. When we reason from particular texts, the argument frequently turns upon the meaning of a single term; and as words have different significations, we are somewhat liable to mistake the import of a term, and hence all arguments of this sort are more or less uncertain. But where we draw our argument from the fundamental principles of the word of God—where the conclusion results from the very being of scriptures, and any other conclusion would oppose the whole design of revelation, we arrive at the highest degree of moral certainty.

But if there is any charm in particular passages, any thing like ocular demonstration in the precise phraseology of the scriptures, we can produce a multitude of passages in support of our views. We are told that Christ came “to save sinners,” “to be for salvation to the ends of the earth,” “to be the Saviour of the world;” that he “died for our sins,” “for the sins of the whole world;” that there was given to him a “kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him;” that he “will reconcile the world to himself,” “swallow up death in victory,” and bring “every creature in heaven and on earth to confess him to be Lord to the glory of God the Father.” This phraseology, with which the Bible is filled, concurs with all the great principles of divine revelation, in sustaining the views we have expressed concerning the nature, design, and extent of the Redeemer’s kingdom.

There is one passage to which we will call especial attention. Christ says to Pilate, “My kingdom is not of this world.” This passage, taken in connexion with the circumstances which called it forth, shows most conclusively the nature of his empire. Judea at that time was subject to the Emperor of Rome, and was ruled by a Roman governor. Before Pilate, this Roman governor, the Jews accused the Saviour. Knowing that the Romans suspected them of conspiring against their authority, and of intending to raise up a prince of their own who should deliver them from the Roman yoke, they brought Jesus before Pilate, and accused him of being, or pretending to be, a temporal prince, and of course an enemy to the Romans. Pilate interrogated him on this subject—“Art thou the king of the Jews?” In answer to this Jesus replies, “My kingdom is not temporal, but spiritual—not secular, but moral.” Our Saviour did not mean to say

that his kingdom did not exist in this world, but that it was not worldly in its character. He meant to inform Pilate that his government was of such a nature as would not in the least interfere with his; that his business was not to lead armies to battle and to victory, but to teach men to subdue their evil passions; that he came not to deliver his people from the Roman yoke, but to redeem them from the bondage of sin and Satan.

The view we have taken of this subject shows that the kingdom of Christ has no reference to climates, states, or worlds, but is the same at all periods of time, and in all modes of existence. His kingdom does not apply to one world to the exclusion of the other. It commences in this state of being, but it is not bounded by our temporal existence. The reign of Christ has no reference to our temporal existence, he takes no cognizance of our earthly being as such. We are his subjects, not temporally and corporally, but morally and intellectually. The death of the body does not in the least affect our allegiance to him, or alter the relation he sustains to us. In all states and worlds, where we are moral and intellectual beings, we are the citizens of his realm, and the subjects of his kingdom.

If we look at the origin or design, nature or extent of Christ's kingdom, we shall be led irresistibly to the conclusion that it extends into a future life.

In what then did this kingdom originate? What gave rise to the reign of the Redeemer? It resulted from the goodness of God. The divine Teacher himself, says that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son." The mission of Christ then originated in divine benevolence. And this unpurchased benevolence existed from eternity, fills all space, extends to all worlds and all beings. It was moreover manifested to the world, when they were "dead in trespasses and sins." And unless we limit the goodness of God to the brief period of human existence, we must allow that the kingdom of grace extends into a future life.

The nature of Christ's kingdom confirms this opinion. We have already seen that his kingdom is a moral kingdom; that he sways his empire not over our bodies, but our minds. If his empire were temporal, its operations would cease with our temporal existence; if his sway were to be exerted over our bodies merely, it would cease with our natural lives. But his kingdom relates to our moral and intellectual existence. And do these cease at temporal death? Does man cease to be an intelligent being, when he changes the mode of his existence? Does he cease to be accountable to his God, when he

throws off this frail body? Certainly not. Man is a moral and an intelligent being in a future world, and as such is a subject of Christ's kingdom.

The design of the gospel kingdom absolutely requires that it should extend to all worlds, where sinful beings are found, and that it should continue till its end be accomplished. Every consideration which could have prompted the divine Being to constitute this kingdom, or his Son to accept the trust committed to him, applies to a future life as much as to the present. And besides, if we look at the great object which the gospel has in view, we must allow that it is not limited to our present mode of existence. The gospel is designed to destroy sin and to reconcile all men to God; but this is not accomplished in this world. Does sin put off its sinfulness by passing the vale of death? Surely not. Then the gospel must extend into a future life, or its object is not attained. Is the enormity of sin increased by temporal death? Not in the least. Why then is not man the subject of mercy as much after death as before? We cannot for the honour of Christ allow that death bounds his empire. It would be a total defeat on the part of the Captain of our salvation, to permit every rebel subject who happens to pass the defile of death, to remain in rebellion to eternity.

And further; the multitudes who died before the advent of Christ, and those in heathen lands who have never heard of him, and infants and idiots in countries where the gospel is known, are all the subjects of Christ's kingdom. But they die without even knowing that they have such a Prince. How can they in any rational sense of the term be said to be Christ's subjects, unless his kingdom extend beyond death? How can they be accountable to him of whom they know nothing? or "how can they believe on him of whom they have not heard?" We have already seen that the kingdom of Christ is universal, that all men are given him of the Father, and that he extends his laws over the whole human family. But practically this cannot be true in this life. His reign can affect none but those who hear of him, are made acquainted with his laws, and are subdued by their converting influence. In what practical sense are the heathen the subjects of Christ's kingdom in this state? They do not obey his laws, for they do not know them; they have no faith in his name, for they have never heard of him. This is true of a vast majority of the human family. From the creation to the present time, not one in ten thousand while on earth, has ever heard of the name of Christ. Now with what propriety can the scriptures teach that all men are given to Christ, and that his kingdom includes every human being, if his

reign is confined to this world? These scriptures can have no tolerable sense, if the reign of Christ be limited to our temporal existence.

Thus we see that every view, which we can take of the subject, leads us to reject the popular notion that the mediatorial kingdom begins and ends here in time. We must give up all our notions of the nature, extent, and design of Christ's kingdom, supported as they are by the living oracles of God, or reject that opinion which limits the grace of the Holy One of Israel to our earthly existence.

We are told on the authority of an inspired apostle, that this world does not bound the reign of the Redeemer. St. Paul says, "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died and rose and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living." Here we are expressly told that the living and the dead are the Lord's, and that Christ died and rose that he might possess them. But how can Christ be Lord of the dead, if the means of grace are confined to this world? We allow that he may be Lord of the dead, inasmuch as he will raise them from the grave, and bring them to the bar of his judgment-seat. But this cannot be the only sense in which he is their Lord or Ruler. We have already shown that his kingdom is moral, and that its object is to change the character, and renovate the heart. But the resurrection, self-considered, is a mere physical process, and can accomplish no end in the kingdom of grace. As it does not of itself renovate the heart, so of itself, it can never bring about that subjection which is the ultimate object of the Saviour's mission. The same may be said of the judgment, if it inflicts an endless punishment. It can do nothing towards improving the mind, subduing the unholy affections, or regenerating the heart—the grand object for which the Messiah's kingdom was ordained. If Christ is Lord of the dead only, as he will raise them to life, and adjudge them to an endless punishment, he is not the Lord of them in any sense, that will subserve the great object of his mission. We must then allow that Christ is Lord of the dead in some benevolent sense—in some sense which will improve them in virtue and happiness; or else allow that he died on the cross and arose from the dead to attain an object which has nothing to do with the design of his mission.

That Christ did continue his labours in a future life, is evident from the testimony of St. Peter. He informs us that the gospel was preached to the dead; that Christ after his crucifixion went and preached to the inhabitants of the old world, who were disobedient in

the days of Noah. This passage appears to me to be decisive on this subject. I am aware of the different expositions which have been given of this passage, and I am equally aware that they contradict the apostle in almost every particular; and that, if such latitude is taken in expounding the word of God, we can make the sacred volume teach what we please.

In the popular theology of the day, *death* is made to occupy a very commanding position. One class of Christians contends that death destroys all sinfulness, and introduces all men into heaven in a moment; the other that it cuts off the means of grace, and fixes the character for eternity.

Both of these representations make death more powerful than the Lord Jesus Christ. The one supersedes the gospel, the other defeats it. The former makes death the saviour, the latter the destroyer of a great part of mankind. But the advocates of both these systems seem to mistake the nature of Christ's kingdom. They seem to forget that man is a moral being, and that his character is affected by moral and not by physical causes. They appear to regard our holy religion as a mere physical engine, and man as a piece of passive machinery. They degrade the gospel by confounding it with the laws of nature, and thus detract from the honour of Christ. They both ascribe to death, a mere physical operation, the power of affecting character. The former supposes that death will convert the most abandoned in an instant into the confirmed saint, so that he will be for ever beyond the reach of all punishment, and be in the enjoyment of the most perfect bliss; the latter supposes that death so corrupts the sinner as to place him in an instant beyond the reach of mercy, and to consign him to infinite, interminable anguish. But it is strange, passing strange, that men with the scriptures in their hands can so mistake the nature of the gospel, as to degrade this spiritual, divine, life-giving system, below the frigid laws which govern senseless matter! It is surprising that death should be thought so potent as to supersede or defeat the mission of Christ, when the scriptures declare that he came to destroy death, and him that hath the power of death!

The position that death places us beyond the reach of mercy, is in direct opposition to the system of those who advance it. On this position all who die in infancy must be cast off for ever. But will any sect of Christians at this day so far outrage every principle of common sense and every feeling of humanity, as to contend that all who die in infancy will be lost? We think they will not. All then who allow that infants will be saved, must allow that there will be a change after death. I would gladly inquire of those who believe that

infants who die in infancy will be saved, by what means they are to be qualified for the joys of heaven? The scriptures are clear upon this point. They assert that all who are saved, must be saved by the Lord Jesus. He is our only hope for eternal life—the only name given under heaven whereby we can be saved. But as his kingdom is moral, he saves only by moral means.

But infants never enjoyed these means. Being called away in a few days or months from its birth, the infant in this state had no knowledge of Christ, of his mediation, doctrines, or salvation. Without a knowledge of Christ and a faith in his mediation, the infant can never be saved. But this knowledge was not possessed, nor this faith exercised in this world. Now, unless a knowledge of the gospel is imparted, and the child is instructed after death, it must come short of salvation. Those, then, with whom we contend, must either allow that innocent infants will be cast off for ever, or that the mercy of God and the means of grace will extend beyond death. But to meet this argument we shall perhaps be presented with the cold, deistical notion, that we do not know how men will be saved, that we ought to leave infants to the mercy of God. We allow that infants and all others should be left to the mercy of God;—but how will he manifest his mercy? Only in the manner pointed out in the gospel—through the agency of Christ, by the use of those means which he has ordained. The insinuation that God will save infants and those who do not hear of Christ in this world, without the usual means of the gospel, is an infidel insinuation, and, as far as it has any bearing upon the subject, goes to support the position that the mediation of Christ is useless, and that men may be saved without the Redeemer as well as with. Nor is it proper to attempt to resolve it all into darkness and doubt. To say that we do not know how God performs his works, and that we have no right to inquire how infants will be saved, is to confess that the gospel is an imperfect guide, and that we ought not to improve our powers, nor attempt to understand the way of salvation. Such insinuations might be expected from the enemies of revealed religion, but they come with an ill grace from professed Christians.

The remarks we have made upon infants will apply to idiots, and the whole heathen world. They must all come short of salvation, unless the means of grace are extended beyond the grave. But perhaps it will be asked, whether the scriptures do not teach the sentiment, that there will be no work of grace in eternity. We answer no, not to our understanding. We have, we think, clearly shown that the gospel as a means of salvation applies to all states where sinners

•

exist ; and if the scriptures teach the opposite they contradict themselves. We know that there are a few passages which are thought by some to favour the latter sentiment, but we believe that they yield no support to that sentiment into whose services they are frequently pressed.

But we are sometimes asked with astonishment, Can a dead man repent ? We will ask in our turn, Can a dead man praise God ? Every Christian will allow that men after death are intellectually able to exercise gratitude, and that the saints will praise God and the Lamb. And if men have the intellectual ability to exercise gratitude, they must have intellectual ability to exercise contrition. To deny this is to deny a future life altogether. If men, intellectually considered, cannot exercise penitence, they cannot exercise any other affection, and hence must be incapable of either pleasure or pain.

Perhaps it may be asked, why the sentiment here opposed, should become so general, if it is not taught in the scriptures ? It is no easy matter to trace every error to its source. The Jews in the days of Christ expected a temporal Messiah ; but it would be difficult perhaps to account for this perversion of their scriptures. But the case before us is somewhat plain. The primitive Church generally believed in a future probation. Among the advocates of this sentiment may be mentioned Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Didymus the Blind, Gregory Nyssen, John of Jerusalem, and many others. This doctrine was popular at the time the Romish Church was growing into power. On this scripture doctrine they found their absurd notions of purgatory and indulgences. These abuses were carried to such excess as to produce the Reformation in the sixteenth century. We all know the feelings which the early Reformers exercised towards the Papal Church ; they were disposed to put down indulgences at all events. Believing that indulgences grew in some degree out of the doctrine of a future probation, they did not distinguish between the true doctrine and its abuse, but rejected them together. And this enmity to the Catholic Church has prevented, in a good degree, a faithful and impartial examination of the subject. The taunt that this is the Catholic Purgatory, has prevented thousands from examining the subject, and has silenced many who have believed that the grace of God extended beyond the confines of this world.

But the faithful inquirer after truth will follow demonstration, wherever it may lead him. And what if this doctrine has been embraced and abused by the Catholics ? In the days of the apostles, there were those who turned the grace of God into lasciviousness. But must we as Christians reject every thing which has been abused ? Must

we yield every thing which the Papists have perverted? Must we give up divine existence, because the Papists entertained false notions of God? Must we give up the Eucharist, because they believed in transubstantiation? or the doctrine of forgiveness, because they believed in the absolution of the Pope?

Every lover of the gospel, every friend of the Lord Jesus, will abide by the teachings of the scriptures, whether the doctrine be popular or unpopular, whether it has been perverted or not. The gospel itself has been unpopular, and is often abused; but we do not feel disposed to reject it on that account. So of the views we have here maintained. They may be unpopular; but we believe that they are the truth, and we are confident that they must and will prevail. They are interwoven with the very nature of the gospel, and we think that they must stand or fall with it. They grow out of the character of God, and are as immutable as the divine nature. They result from the mission of Christ, and must be adopted to give success to his reign. We do not then despair of the triumph of these views; but we rather rejoice that they are fast gaining ground, and trust in the promises of God for their final accomplishment. Let us then confide in the sovereign mercy of God, and yield cheerfully to him who has emphatically said, *that his kingdom is not of this world.*

Restorationists contend that this doctrine is not only sustained by popular texts, but grows necessarily out of some of the first principles of divine revelation. They maintain that it is immediately connected with the perfections of the Deity; that God, being infinitely benevolent, must have desired the happiness of all his offspring; that his infinite wisdom would enable him to form a perfect plan, and his almighty power will secure its accomplishment. They contend that the mission of Christ is abortive on any other plan, and that nothing short of the "restitution of all things" can satisfy the ardent desires of every pious soul. On this system alone can they reconcile the attributes of justice and mercy, and secure to the Almighty a character worthy of our imitation.

They insist that the words rendered, *everlasting, eternal, and for ever*, which are in a few instances applied to the misery of the wicked, do not prove that misery to be endless; because these terms are loose in their signification, and are frequently used in a limited sense; that the original terms being often used in the plural number, clearly demonstrates that the period, though indefinite, is limited in its very nature. They maintain that the meaning of the term must always be sought in the subject to which it is applied; and that there is

nothing in the nature of punishment which will justify an endless sense.*

It is hardly necessary to enter into an elaborate argument to sustain the positions here laid down. It has been shown again and again by some of the brightest ornaments of the church, that the terms rendered *everlasting* and *for ever* are indefinite in their signification, and are used with great latitude. Instances have been produced in which the Hebrew word *olam* occurs in the Old Testament, in connexion with terms and phrases, the literal rendering of which would be, "for ever, and farther," "for ever and ever, and farther," "for ever, and *beyond it*;"—a circumstance which plainly shows that the word is used in a limited sense. In many places *olam* is rendered *ancient* and *old*, and is applied to landmarks, people, paths, places, times, nations, &c. (See Prov. xxii. 28; Isa. xlv. 7; Jer. xviii. 15; Ezek. xxxvi. 2; Ps. lxxvii. 5; Deut. xxii. 7; Isa. lxiii. 9; Job xxii. 15; Prov. xxiii. 10.) This term is also rendered, *any, long, any time, long time, long home, long dead*, &c. All of which clearly proves that an absolute eternity cannot be the signification of the term in these passages.

The term in the New Testament which corresponds with *olam* in the old, is *aion*, and is variously rendered. Paul speaks of walking according to the *course* of this world, of the *ages* to come, and of the mystery hid from *ages* and generations. In these passages *aion* is translated *course* and *ages*, and consequently is used in a limited sense. The same term is rendered *world* in nearly thirty passages of scripture. The apostle speaks of "the god of *this world*," "the ruler of *this world*," "the princes of *this world*," and the "disputes of *this world*;" of being "delivered from the *present evil world*," and of being "conformed to *this world*." We also read of the *end* of the *world*, of events which occurred *before the world was*, and *before the foundation of the world*; also, from the *beginning of the world*, and since the *world began*. We also read of the *worlds* in the plural, and even of the *ends* of the *worlds*. (See 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. v. 12; 1 Cor. i. 20; Gal. i. 4; Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 6, and many other texts.) In these and many other texts, *aion* is rendered *world*, and hence must have a limited signification; for it would be absurd to speak of *this eternity*, of the *end* of the eternity, &c.

We would pursue this subject farther, but it is thought unnecessary. Every intelligent believer in the doctrine of endless misery will readily allow, that these terms are very frequently, if not generally, used in

* Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge.

a limited sense. These terms are allowed to have a great latitude of signification—sometimes they are used in an endless sense, and sometimes in a limited sense. It is manifest then that they can prove nothing in this controversy. We admit that these terms are in a few instances applied to the misery of the wicked; but they do not and cannot of themselves prove this misery to be endless. The word is of doubtful signification, and its meaning must be sought in the context, or determined by the subject, or from other passages. The advocates of interminable punishment show the weakness of their cause, by resting it upon terms which they themselves allow to be of doubtful signification.

In fact, the argument founded upon the words, *for ever*, *everlasting*, &c., if it were sound, would overthrow the whole gospel dispensation. The Jew can employ it against Christianity with as much force, as the believers in endless misery can employ it against the restoration. The gospel itself professes to supersede the legal dispensation, and rests its claims upon the fact, that the priesthood of Aaron, and the rites of the law were never designed to be perpetual. But the Jew will tell you that the terms *everlasting*, *eternal*, and *for ever*, are applied in nearly a hundred instances to the rites and ceremonies, or something connected with the dispensation of their great lawgiver; that these words imply an endless duration, and consequently prove the perpetuity of the law, and hence the falsity of the gospel. And how is it possible to meet this argument, unless we allege the fact, that these words are used in a limited sense? Let the believers in endless punishment refute this argument of the Jew; and when they have done that, they will see, that we can reply to them in their own language, and show that they cannot prove misery to be endless from the strength of these words without proving at the same time that Judaism is perpetual and the gospel false.

But we are told that these terms are applied to happiness as well as misery, and that if we limit the duration of misery, we limit the duration of happiness. A few remarks will show the futility of this argument. We do not prove that happiness will be endless, by the strength of these words, but by terms, and phrases much stronger than the words *everlasting* and *for ever*,—by terms and phrases which have no exception in their meaning. It is said of the righteous, “*neither can they die any more, for they are equal to the angels;*” they are said to be happy, “*world without end,*” and to have an inheritance and a crown “*incorruptible, undefiled, that fadeth not away.*” It is said of them that, “*they shall not be hurt of the second death,*”—that “*there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying.*” They

are likewise said to possess "an enduring substance," and "a kingdom which cannot be moved." St. Paul assures us, "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord."

While these terms and phrases, which have no exception in their signification, are applied to the happiness of the righteous: the punishment of the wicked is expressed by terms and phrases which naturally denote a limited period. They are compared to *wood, hay, and stubble, to chaff, and a withered branch*. There is also this remarkable difference between happiness and misery: the former is an *end*,—the grand object for which man was created, and the mediatorial kingdom established. But no one will say that misery is the end at which the Deity aimed in creation and redemption. Misery is a means and not an end. As a means, punishment is perfectly consistent with the divine character, and the design of his administration; but as an end it would be repugnant to both. Endless happiness then is immediately connected with the character and purposes of God, and is as certain as his immutable designs; while endless misery is at war with the perfections of the Almighty, and subversive of his gracious designs.

But we are told that the happiness of the righteous, and the misery of the wicked are contrasted; and that in this contrast the same terms, *everlasting*, and *eternal*, are applied to denote the duration of both; and that, if the one be endless, the same must be true of the other. This is the most plausible argument which can be urged in support of ceaseless torment. We will, however, state the reasons which satisfy us, that the argument is unsound. If there is any strength in this argument, it must rest either upon the meaning of the word "everlasting," or upon the alleged fact that happiness and misery are contrasted. As to the meaning of the word, we have already shown that it is used in a great variety of senses; sometimes it denotes endless, and sometimes limited duration. But its signification must always depend upon the nature of the subject to which it is applied. When it is joined to the happiness of the saints, it takes an endless sense; not from the natural import of the term, but from the nature of the subject to which it is applied. Endless happiness is established beyond a doubt, independently of the use of this ambiguous term; and having established that point, the word "everlasting" takes an endless sense, from the character of the subject to which it is applied. To make the cases parallel, the absolute eternity of punishment must be proved

independently of this term. But the believers of ceaseless punishment always press this doubtful term into the controversy; and in this way they admit that they cannot prove their position without the passages in which this term occurs. But what sort of reasoning is this? Why, they attempt to prove a doubtful point by the use of a word equally doubtful. Let them prove the endless duration of punishment independently of the use of this term; and then, but not till then, will it follow with any degree of certainty, that *everlasting* is used in an endless sense, when applied to this subject of punishment.

Nor is it true, that the antithesis requires that the same term should have the same signification in both members of the sentence. Take the famous passage in the 25th chapter of Matthew,—“These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.” Suppose the meaning to be that, the one goes into endless happiness, but the other into a long and severe punishment. The contrast here is just as perfect, as though the one continued as long as the other. The object of the Saviour was, to contrast the condition of the two classes, rather than the duration of the life on the one side, and the punishment on the other.

Besides there is evidence in this very passage that the punishment here spoken of, is not endless. The Greek word rendered punishment is *kolasis*, which critics define to signify *chastisement*, or that punishment which is inflicted for the good of the sufferer. Dr. Smith, in his *Treatise on Divine Government*, published a few years since in England, says that *kolasis* invariably denotes a *corrective punishment*. Hedericus gives *chastisement* as the prominent meaning of *kolasis*. Grotius says expressly, “that kind of punishment which tends to improve the criminal is what the philosophers called *kolasis*, or chastisement.” See also “*Improved Version of New Testament*.” Here it will be seen, that the very passage which is relied upon in proof of endless misery, contains evidence of the limited nature of punishment. Chastisement of itself implies a limitation, and as the word *everlasting* is applied to chastisement, or a word of that import, it must be used in a limited sense.

But as great reliance is placed upon the fact that in the 25th chapter of Matthew, the word rendered *everlasting* occurs twice; and as it is inferred from this, that it must have the same meaning in both cases: we will refer to several other passages, where the same word occurs twice, and where all will admit that the sense is not the same in each case. In Romans xvi. 25, 26, Paul speaks of the “mystery which was kept secret since the *world* began, but is now made manifest, according to the commandment of the *everlasting* God.” In this pas-

sage the word in question occurs twice; in one case it is rendered *world*, and in the other *everlasting*. In the latter case the term has an endless sense, because it is applied to the Deity; in the former case it is used in a limited sense, because the passage speaks of the *beginning* of the *world*. In Titus i. 2, the apostle speaks of *eternal* life which God promised before the *world* began. Here again the same word occurs twice. Once it is rendered *eternal* and applied to life, and consequently is used in an endless sense; and once it is rendered *world*, and must be used in a limited sense, for it would be an absurdity to speak of the beginning and end of eternity. In Habak. iii. 6, the word "*everlasting*" is twice employed; once it is applied to the mountains, which the passage declares, "were scattered," and once to the ways of God, which we know are unchangeable.

We have here three several instances in which the terms rendered *everlasting* and *for ever* are twice employed in the same passage, by way of antithesis; and yet every person will admit that the word has one meaning in one part of the sentence, and another meaning in the other. Why then may not the same term in the same construction be employed to denote an endless duration in the one case, and a limited duration in the other, in the 25th of Matthew, as well as in the 16th of Romans, the 1st of Titus, or the 3d of Habakkuk?

From what we have offered upon this subject, I think it follows most conclusively that the words rendered *eternal* and *for ever*, are loose and indefinite in their meaning; and that we must look at the subject to which they are applied, in order to determine their sense in any given case. It has also been shown that there is nothing in the nature of punishment which would give an endless sense to the term, when applied to that subject; but on the contrary, chastisement, the only punishment worthy of a merciful God, necessarily implies a limitation.

But in contending for the final subjugation of the world, we do not overlook the agency of man. It is no part of our creed that man is to be passive in the great work of salvation. We believe that all men will ultimately be made happy; because we believe that all men will of their own accord bow submissively and become the willing subjects of the Prince of Peace. The free agency instead of constituting any objection to our views, is the medium through which the Spirit of God operates in bringing men to holiness and happiness. On any system of religion, those who are saved, are saved willingly; and if one free agent can be brought to penitence without impairing his freedom, the same may be true of all.

Restorationists believe that the doctrine of the Restoration is the

most consonant to the perfections of the Deity, the most worthy of the character of Christ, and the only doctrine which will accord with pious and devout feelings, or harmonize with the scriptures. They teach their followers, that ardent love to God, active benevolence to man, and personal meekness and purity, are the natural results of those views.

Though the Restorationists, as a separate sect, have arisen within a few years, their sentiments are by no means new. Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Didymus of Alexandria, Gregory Nyssen, and several others, among the Christian fathers of the first four centuries, it is said, believed and advocated the restoration of all fallen intelligences. A branch of the German Baptists, before the Reformation, held this doctrine, and propagated it in that country. Since the Reformation this doctrine has had numerous advocates; and some of them have been among the brightest ornaments of the Church. Among the Europeans, we may mention the names of Jeremy White of Trinity College, Dr. Burnet, Dr. Cheyne, Chevalier Ramsay, Doctor Hartley, Bishop Newton, Mr. Stonehouse, Mr. Petitpierre, Dr. Cogan, Mr. Lindsey, Dr. Priestley, Dr. Jebb, Mr. Rely, Mr. Kenrick, Mr. Belsham, Dr. Southworth Smith, and many others. In fact the Restoration is the commonly received doctrine among the English Unitarians at the present day. In Germany, a country which, for several centuries, has taken the lead in all theological reforms, the orthodox have espoused this doctrine.

The Restoration was introduced into America about the middle of the eighteenth century; though it was not propagated much till about 1775 or 1780, when John Murray and Elhanan Winchester became public advocates of this doctrine, and by their untiring labours extended it in every direction. From that time to the present, many men have been found in all parts of our country, who have rejoiced in this belief. This doctrine found an able advocate in the learned Dr. Chauncey, of Boston. Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia, Dr. Smith, of New York, Mr. Foster, of New Hampshire, may also be mentioned as advocates of the Restoration.

Most of the writers, whose names are given above, did not belong to a sect which took the distinctive name of Restorationists. They were found in the ranks of the various sects into which the Christian world has been divided. And those who formed a distinct sect were more frequently denominated Universalists than Restorationists. In 1785, a convention was organized at Oxford, Massachusetts, under the auspices of Messrs. Winchester and Murray. And as all who

had embraced universal salvation believed, that the effects of sin and the means of grace extended into a future life : the terms *Restorationist* and *Universalist* were then used as synonymous ; and those who formed that convention adopted the latter as their distinctive name.

During the first twenty-five years, the members of the Universalist Convention were believers in a future retribution. But about the year 1818, Hosea Ballou, now of Boston, advanced the doctrine that all retribution is confined to this world.

That sentiment at first was founded upon the old Gnostic notion, that all sin originates in the flesh, and that death frees the soul from all impurity. Subsequently some of the advocates for the no-future-punishment scheme, adopted the doctrine of materialism, and hence maintained that the soul was mortal ; that the whole man died a temporal death, and that the resurrection was the grand event which would introduce all men into heavenly felicity.

Those who have since taken to themselves the name of Restorationists, viewed these innovations as corruptions of the gospel, and raised their voices against them. But a majority of the convention having espoused these sentiments, no reformation could be effected.

The Restorationists, believing these errors to be increasing, and finding in the connexion what appeared to them to be a want of engagedness in the cause of true piety, and in some instances an open opposition to the organization of churches ; and finding that a spirit of levity and bitterness characterized the public labours of their brethren, and that practices were springing up totally repugnant to the principles of Congregationalism, resolved to obey the apostolic injunction, by coming out from among them, and forming an independent association. Accordingly a convention, consisting of Rev. Paul Dean, Rev. David Pickering, Rev. Charles Hudson, Rev. Adin Ballou, Rev. Lyman Maynard, Rev. Nathaniel Wright, Rev. Philemon R. Russell, and Rev. Seth Chandler, and several laymen, met at Mendon, Massachusetts, August 17, 1831, and formed themselves into a distinct sect, and took the name of Universal Restorationists.

Since the organization of this association, they have had accessions of six or seven clergymen, so that their whole number of clergymen in 1834, was estimated at fourteen, and the number of their societies at ten or twelve. With all or nearly all these societies an organized church is associated. These societies are principally in Massachusetts, though there is a large society in Providence, Rhode Island, and one in New York city. The largest societies are those of Boston and Providence.

The Independent Messenger, a paper published weekly at Mendon, Massachusetts, by Rev. Adin Ballou, is devoted to the cause of Restorationism.

It ought also to be stated in connexion with this, that there are several clergymen who agree with the Restorationists in sentiment, who still adhere to the Universalist connexion. And if we were to present a complete list of those who believe that all men will ultimately be restored, we might enumerate many of the Unitarian and *Christian* clergymen. This sentiment prevails more or less among the laity of every sect. The Restorationists are Congregationalists on the subject of church government.

In relation to the *trinity*, *atonement*, and *free will*, the Restorationists' views harmonize with those of the Unitarians.

In relation to *water baptism*, they maintain that it may be administered by immersion, suffusion, or sprinkling, either to adults or infants. They do not regard baptism as a saving ordinance; and they are rather disposed to continue this rite from the example of Christ and his apostles, than from any positive command contained in the New Testament. They maintain that the sacrament of the Supper is expressly commanded by Christ, and should be open to all believers of every name and sect; and while they admit that every organized church should have the power to manage its own private and local affairs, they recognise no power in any church to exclude believers of other denominations from the table of our common Master.

The difference between the Restorationists and Universalists relates principally to the subject of a future retribution. The Universalists believe that a full and perfect retribution takes place in this world, that our conduct here cannot affect our future condition, and that the moment man exists after death, he will be as pure and as happy as the angels. From these views the Restorationists dissent. They maintain that a just retribution does not take place in time; that the conscience of the sinner becomes callous, and does not increase in the severity of its reprovings with the increase of guilt; that men are invited to act with reference to a future life; that if all are made perfectly happy at the commencement of the next state of existence, they are not rewarded according to their deeds; that if death introduces them into heaven, they are saved by death, and not by Christ; and if they are made happy by being raised from the dead, they are saved by physical, and not by moral means, and made happy without their agency or consent; that such a sentiment weakens the motives to virtue, and gives force to the temptations of vice; that it is unreasonable in itself, and opposed to many passages of scripture.

SHAKERS.

BY THOMAS BROWN,

ORANGE CO., N. Y.

THE Shakers, or the Millennial Church, the subject of this article, hold that the Apostolic Church gradually degenerated, and finally became a church of Antichrist, under the favour and protection of Constantine, the Roman emperor; but, at the same time, profess to believe that God has, in every age, raised up witnesses to bear testimony against sin and the power of Antichrist; among these they claim to be, and profess to be of those known by the name of the French prophets who were raised up, and endued with the true spirit of prophecy; and that they were the two witnesses mentioned by St. John, who "after three days and a half," *i. e.* twelve hundred and sixty years, "stood upon their feet," *i. e.* were not slain or persecuted unto death.

The French prophets alluded to, first appeared in Dauphiny and the Cevennes in France, about 1688; in a few years, several hundred Protestants professed to be inspired; their bodies were much agitated with various operations: when they received the spirit of prophecy, they trembled, staggered, and fell down and lay as if they were dead; they recovered twitching, shaking, and crying to God for mercy for themselves and for all mankind, not only in their assemblies, but at other meetings. Three of their most distinguished prophets, namely, Elias Marlon, John Cavilier, and Durand Fage, left France about the year 1705, and repaired to London, where they also began to prophesy, with the like operations and ecstasies, as in France. In England they met with much opposition. Several of the prophets went from London to Scotland, and afterwards to Holland, where the magistrates committed them to prison.

James Wardley, a tailor by trade, and Jane, his wife, formerly Quakers, lived at Bolton, county of Lancashire, England, joined the French prophets in testifying against all the churches then in standing. About the year 1747, several other persons were added to them and

a small society formed without any established creed or particular manner of worship, as they professed to be only beginning to learn the new and living way of complete salvation, which had long been the subject of prophecy; and therefore they professed to be resigned, to be led and governed, from time to time, as the Spirit of God might dictate. The principal members were, beside Wardley and his wife, John Townley, of Manchester, and his wife, and John Kattis, who, it is said, was a scholar; but did not retain his faith. Wardley and his wife, Jane, conducted their meetings. Jane Wardley was called "mother," and to her confessions of sin were made. She had the principal lead in their meetings. In 1757, Ann Lee joined their society, by confessing her sins to Jane Wardley. Ann was born about the year 1735; at a marriageable age she entered the bonds of matrimony with Abraham Stanley; some years after joining the society, Ann united her testimony against "the root of human depravity;" and professed she had received the greatest gift; and from the year 1768 or 69, she was owned as the "spiritual mother," and took the lead of the society, thenceforth familiarly known as "Mother Ann." Their society, in the year 1772, numbered about thirty persons, though many more had joined it, but had fallen off. As the prospects of any further increase were gloomy, as the people in general disbelieved their testimony, Mother Ann, about that time, received a revelation from God to repair to America. She prophesied of a great increase and permanent establishment of the church and work of God in this country. Accordingly, as many as firmly believed in her testimony, and could settle their temporal concerns and furnish necessities for the voyage, concluded to follow her; they procured a passage at Liverpool, in the ship Maria, Capt. Smith, and arrived at New York in 1774. Those who came with the "mother" were her husband Abraham Stanley, William Lee, James Whittaker, John Parlington, and Mary his wife; John Hocknell, James Shepard, and one Ann Lee, the "mother's" niece. In the spring of 1776 she went to Albany, thence to Niskeuna, now Water Vliet, eight miles from Albany, where a small society was established in Sept., 1776, and still exists. They own here about 2000 acres of good land, well cultivated, and divided into four farms, on each of which is a family, the whole amounting to about 80 persons of both sexes and all ages. From this society have grown several communities, one of which is established at New Lebanon, N. Y. The community here consists of about 600 members, divided into several orders and families. Another community is found in the State of New York, in Wayne county; another at Enfield, Connecticut; and two in Ohio, one at

Union village, in the county of Warren, thirty miles from Cincinnati, which contains nearly 600 members; and one at Beaver creek, in Montgomery county, six miles southeast of Dayton, which contains rising 100 members. In Kentucky there are two societies, one at Pleasant Hill, Mercer county, containing about 500 members; one in Logan county, which contains nearly 400 members. One society at West Union, Knox county, Indiana, with rising of 200 members.

Among their first, and distinguished converts were David Darrow, Valentine Rathbone, a Baptist preacher, Daniel Rathbone, and Reuben Rathbone. Valentine Rathbone renounced his union with the society within a few months after he had joined them, and soon published a pamphlet against their faith and practice.

Their number had been considerable at one time in the United States, but on the death of "Mother Ann," who died at Water Vliet, Sept. 8, 1784, they began to diminish.* They live in communities, and are generally instructed to be very industrious, and to bring in according to their ability to keep up the meeting. They vary in their religious exercises; their heaving dancing, as it is called, is performed by a perpetual springing from the house floor, about four inches up and down, both in the men's and women's apartments, moving about with extraordinary transport, singing, sometimes one at a time, sometimes more, making a perfect charm. They sometimes fall on their knees, and make a sound like the roaring of many waters, in groans and cries to God, as they say, for the wicked world who persecute them.

Their religious tenets are as follows: We believe that the first light of salvation was given or made known to the patriarchs by promise; and that they, who believed in the promise of Christ, and were obedient to the command of God made known unto them, were the people of God, and were accepted by him as righteous, or perfect in their generation, according to the measure of light and truth manifested unto them: which were as *waters to the ankles*; signified by Ezekiel's vision of the holy waters (chap. 47). And although they could not receive regeneration, or the fulness of salvation, from the fleshly and fallen nature in this life; because the fulness of time was not yet come that they should receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost, for the destruction of the body of sin, and purification of the soul. But

* In 1828, the number of societies was sixteen; the number of preachers about forty-five, members gathered into their societies, about 4500; those not received, 900; making in all about 5400.—EDITOR.

Abraham, called and chosen of God, as the father of the faithful, was received into covenant relation with God by promise; that in him, and his seed, all the families of the earth should be blessed. And the earthly blessings, which were promised to Abraham, were a shadow of a gospel or spiritual blessings to come. And circumcision, or outward cutting of the foreskin of the flesh, did not cleanse the man from sin, but was a sign of the spiritual baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire. Which is by the power of God manifested in divers operations and gifts of the spirit, as in the days of the apostles, which does indeed destroy the body of sin or fleshly nature, and purify the man from all sin, both soul and body. So that Abraham, though in the full faith of the promise, yet as he did not receive the substance of the thing promised, his hopes of eternal salvation was in Christ, by the gospel, to be attained in the resurrection from the dead.

The second dispensation was the law that was given of God to Israel, by the hand of Moses; which was a farther manifestation of that salvation, which was promised through Christ by the gospel, both in the order and ordinances, instituted and given unto Israel, as the Church and people of God, according to that dispensation which was as *waters to the knees* (Ezek. xlvii. 4); by which they were distinguished from all the families of the earth. For while they were faithful and strictly obedient to all the commands, ordinances, and statutes that God gave: they were approved of God according to the promise for life, and blessings were promised unto them in the line of obedience; cursing and death in disobedience, (Deut. xxviii. 12, 15.) For God, who is ever jealous for the honour and glory of his own great name, always dealt with them according to his word. For while they were obedient to the commands of God, and purged out sin from among them, God was with them, according to his promise. But when they disobeyed the commands of God, and committed sin, and became like other people: the hand of the Lord was turned against them; and those evils came upon them which God had threatened. So we see that they, who were wholly obedient to the will of God, made known in that dispensation, were accepted as just or righteous. Yet as that dispensation was short, they did not attain that salvation which was promised in the gospel; so that, as it respected the new birth, or real purification of the man from all sin, *the law made nothing perfect* (Heb. vii. 19); *but was a shadow of good things to come*, (1 Cor. ii. 17; Heb. x.) Their only hope of eternal redemption was in the promise of Christ, by the gospel, to be attained in the resurrection from the dead.

The third dispensation was the gospel of Christ's first appearance

in the flesh, which was as *water to the loins*, (Ezek. xlvii. 4,) and that salvation which took place in consequence of his life, death, resurrection, and ascension to the right hand of the Father, being accepted in his obedience, as the *first born among many brethren*, (Rom. viii. 29,) he received power and authority to administer the power of the resurrection and eternal judgment to all the children of men. So that he has become the *author of eternal salvation unto all that obey him*, (Heb. iv. 9.) And as Christ had this power in himself, he did administer power and authority to his church at the day of Pentecost, as his body, with all the gifts that he had promised them; which was the first gift of the Holy Ghost, as an indwelling comforter, to abide with them for ever; and by which they *were baptized into Christ's death*; death to all sin; and were in the hope of the resurrection from the dead, through the operation of the power of God, which wrought in them. And as they had received the substance of the promise of Christ's coming in the flesh, by the gift and the power of the Holy Ghost: they had power to preach the gospel, in Christ's name, to *every creature*; and to administer the power of God to as many as believed, and were obedient to the gospel which they preached; and to remit and retain sins in the power and authority of Christ on earth. So they, that believed in the gospel, and were obedient to that form of doctrine which was taught them, *by denying all ungodliness and worldly lust*, and became entirely dead unto the law, by the body of Christ, or power of the Holy Ghost, were in travail of the resurrection from the dead or the *redemption of the body*, (Rom. viii. 23.) So that they, who took up a full cross against the world, flesh, and devil, and who forsook all for Christ's sake, and followed him in the regeneration, by persevering in that line of obedience to the end, found the resurrection from the dead, and eternal salvation in that dispensation. But as the nature of that dispensation was only as *water to the loins*, (Ezek. xlvii.,) the mystery of God was not finished; but there was another day prophesied of, called the second appearance of Christ, or final and last display of God's grace to a lost world, in which the *mystery of God should be finished*, (Rev. x. 7,) as he has spoken by his prophets, *since the world began*, (Luke i. 70,) which day could not come, except there was a falling away from that faith and power that the church then stood in, (2 Thess. ii. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Dan. xi. 36-38; xii.,) in which Antichrist was to have his reign, whom Christ should destroy with the spirit of his mouth, and brightness of his appearance, (2 Thess. ii. 8.) Which falling away began soon after the apostles, and gradually increased in the Church, until about A. D. 457, or thereabouts; at which time the

power of the holy people, or Church of Christ was scattered or lost, by reason of transgression, (Dan. xii. 7; viii. 2;) and Antichrist, or false religion, got to be established. Since that time, the witnesses of Christ have prophesied in sackcloth, or under darkness, (Rev. vi. 3.) And thus many have been faithful to testify against sin, even to the laying down of their lives for the testimony which they held, so that God accepted them in their obedience, which they were faithful and just to live, or walk up to the measure of light and truth of God, revealed or made known unto them. But it is written, that all they that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution: and so it has been; and these faithful witnesses lost their lives by those falsely called the Church of Christ, which is Antichrist. For the true Church of Christ never persecuted any; but was inoffensive, harmless, separate from sin. For the true Church of Christ, taking up its cross against the world, flesh, and devil, and all sin, living in obedience to God, earnestly contends for the same. Therefore it may be plainly seen and known where the true church is. But as it is written, Antichrist, or false churches, should prevail against the saints, and overcome them, before Christ's second appearance, (2 Thess. ii. 3:) *Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.* And it was given unto him to overcome all kindreds, tongues, and nations. (Rev. xiii. 7.) And this is the state Christ prophesied the world of mankind should be in, at his second appearance, (Luke xvii. 22-37.) *And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be in the days of the Son of man; even shall it be in the days when the Son of man is revealed.* Plainly referring to his second appearing, to consume and destroy Antichrist, and make a final end of sin, and establish his kingdom upon earth. (Isa. lxxv. 25; Jer. xxxi. 33, 34; Dan. ii. 44; vii. 18, 27, and ix. 27; Oba. ii. 1; Rev. xv. 15, &c.) But as the revelation of Christ is spiritual, it must consequently be in his people, whom he had chosen to be his body, to give testimony of him, and to preach his gospel to a lost world.

The fourth dispensation is the second appearance of Christ, or final and last display of God's grace to a lost world; in which the mystery of God will be finished, as a decisive work, to the final salvation or damnation of all the children of men, which according to the prophecies, rightly calculated and truly understood, began in the year of our Saviour, 1747, (see Daniel and Revelations,) in the manner following: To a number, in the manifestation of great light, and mighty trembling, by the invisible power of God, and visions, revelations, miracles, and prophecies. Which have progressively increased with

administrations of all those spiritual gifts that were administered to the apostles at the day of Pentecost: and these are the Comforter that has led us into all truth; and which was promised to abide with the true Church of Christ unto the end of the world. And by which we find *baptism into Christ's death*, (Rom. vi. 4,) death to all sin; become alive to God, by the power of Christ's resurrection, which worketh in us mightily;—by which a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto us. And wo be unto us if we preach not the gospel of Christ; for in sending so great a salvation and deliverance from the law of sin and death, in believing and obeying this gospel, which is the gospel of Christ; in confessing and forsaking all sin, and denying ourselves, and bearing the cross of Christ against the world, flesh, and devil: we have found *forgiveness* of all our sins, and are made partakers of the grace of God, wherein we now stand. And all others, in believing and obeying, will have acceptance with God, and find salvation from their sins as well as we, God being no respecter of persons, but willing that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved.

SCHWENKFELDERS.

BY ISAAC SCHULTZ,

BERKS CO., PA.

SCHWENKFELDERS are a denomination of Christians, and are so called after Casper Schwenkfeld von Ossing, a Silesian knight, and counsellor to the Duke of Lignitz. He was born (seven years after the Saxon Reformer, Martin Luther, first beheld the light, in Eisleben) in Lower Silesia, A. D. 1490, in the principality of Lignitz. He studied several years at Cologne and other universities; he was well read in the Latin and Greek classics, as well as in the Fathers. He was a man of eminent learning. After finishing his university course, he was taken into service by the Duke of Munsterberg and Brieg, until he was disabled by bodily infirmities from attending to the business of the court. He then applied himself to the study of theology. About this time Luther commenced the Reformation in Germany, which attracted Schwenkfeld's whole attention. Every circumstance in his conduct and appearance was adapted to give him credit and influence. His morals were pure, and his life in all respects exemplary. His exhortations in favour of true and solid piety were warm and persuasive, and his principal zeal was employed in promoting piety among the people; he thus acquired the friendship and esteem of many learned and pious men, both in the Lutheran and Helvetic churches; among these were Luther, Melancthon, &c., whom he held in high esteem, but was decided in his opinion that they still held several relics of Popery in their doctrines.

He differed from Luther and other friends of the Reformation, in three points. The first of these points related to the doctrine concerning the Eucharist. Schwenkfeld inverted these words: "τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου," (Matt. xxvi. 26,) "This is my body," and insisted on their being thus understood: "My body is this," that is, such as is this bread which is broken and consumed; a true and real food, which nourishes, satisfies, and delights the soul. "My blood is this," i.e., such in its effects as the wine, which strengthens and refreshes the

heart. The second point on which he differed from Luther, was in his hypothesis relating to the efficacy of the divine word. He denied, for example, that the external word, which is committed to writing in the scriptures, was endowed with the power of healing, illuminating, and renewing the mind; and he ascribed this power to the internal word, which, according to his opinion, was Christ himself. His doctrine concerning the human nature of Christ, formed the third subject of debate between him and the Lutherans. He would not allow Christ's human nature, in its exalted state, to be called *a creature*, or *a created substance*, as such denomination appeared to him infinitely below his majestic dignity, united as it is, in that glorious state, with the divine essence.

On the first point of difference, Schwenkfeld wrote Luther twelve questions, concerning the impanation of the body of Christ. These Luther answered laconically, but "in his usual rough style,"* told Schwenkfeld he should not irritate the Church of Christ; that the blood of those he should seduce would fall upon his head. Notwithstanding this, he still expostulated with Luther, and desired a candid examination of his arguments, which so irritated Luther that he wrote a maledictory letter to Schwenkfeld.

Schwenkfeld was an indefatigable writer; he produced some ninety treatises and pamphlets, in German and Latin, on religious subjects, most of which were printed, and are yet extant, though whole editions were confiscated and destroyed. He had an extensive correspondence all over the empire, with persons of every rank and description. The principal part of his letters was printed, and three large folio volumes thereof are still left. In his writings, he displayed a penetrating discernment and good judgment, with a true Christian moderation. He often declared, in his writings, that it was by no means his object to form a separate church, and expressed an ardent desire to be serviceable to all Christians, of whatever denomination; but his freedom in giving admonition to those whom he thought erroneous in doctrine, brought on him the enmity, not of Papists only, but of some Protestants. His writings were prohibited to be printed, and such as had been printed were either confiscated or destroyed; and he was obliged to wander from place to place, under various turns of fortune, to escape danger, and to flee from his persecutors, till death put an end to all his trials upon earth; he died in the city of Ulm, 1562, in the 72d year of his

* Luther, in his reply, said: "Kurtzum, entweder ihr, oder wir, müssen des Teufels leibeigen seyn, weil wir uns beyderseits Gottes Worts rühmen," i. e. "In short, either you or we, must be in the bond-service of the devil, because we, on both sides, appeal to God's Word."

age. His learning and piety are acknowledged by all; and even his most bitter antagonists award him this praise.

After his death many, on having read and heard his views, and having embraced them, were known and called Schwenkfelders, and persecuted nearly as much as had been the deceased Schwenkfelder himself. The greatest number of them were in Silesia, particularly in the principalities of Lignitz and Tour. The established clergy there, being Lutherans, resorted to various devices, and used every intrigue, to oppose them; in particular, if they assembled for religious worship, they were thrown into prisons and dungeons, where many of them perished. Such was often their unhappy fate. This was especially their lot in 1590, in 1650, and at a later period.

In 1719, the Jesuits thought the conversion of the Schwenkfelders an object worthy of attention. They sent missionaries to Silesia, who preached to that people the faith of the emperor. They produced imperial edicts, that all parents should attend public worship of the missionaries, and bring their children to be instructed in the holy Catholic faith, under severe penalties. The Schwenkfelders sent deputies to Vienna to solicit for toleration and indulgence; and though the emperor apparently received them with kindness and condescension: yet the Jesuits had the dexterous address to procure another imperial edict, ordering that such parents as would not bring every one of their children to the missionaries for instruction, should at last be chained to the wheel-barrow, and put to hard labour on the public works, and their children should, by force, be brought to the missionaries. Upon this, many families fled, in the night, into Lusatia, and other parts of Saxony, in 1725, sought shelter under the protection of the Senate of Gorlitz, and also of Count Zinzendorf—leaving behind them their effects real and personal, (the roads being beset, in day time, to stop all emigrants.) They dwelt unmolested in their “late sought shelter” about eight years; when, this protection being withdrawn, they resolved to seek a permanent establishment in Pennsylvania. A number of them, in 1734, emigrated to Altona, a considerable city of Denmark, and Holland, thence to Pennsylvania, as will be seen from the sequel.

The last mentioned edict was not put in its fullest rigour by the missionaries till after the death of Charles VI., when another edict was published threatening the total extermination of the remaining Schwenkfelders, from which they were unexpectedly relieved by Frederick, the king of Prussia, making a conquest of all Silesia, who immediately published an edict, in which he invited, by proclamation,

in 1742, all the Schwenkfelders to return to Silesia, who had emigrated, and promised them their estates, with toleration and protection not only in Silesia, but in all other parts of his dominions—but none of those who had emigrated to Pennsylvania, ever returned. Still they kept up an important correspondence with European friends, near half a century, up to the time of the French Revolution.

Having obtained permission from the crown of England to emigrate to Pennsylvania, and their protection in Germany being withdrawn, they left Berthelsdorf and Gorlitz in April 1734, for Altona, in Denmark, where they arrived May 17th; thence they sailed for America, and after a tedious and long voyage they arrived at Philadelphia the 22d Sept., 1734, and on the 5th of October of the same year, several other families arrived. They settled principally in Montgomery, Berks, Bucks and Lehigh counties, Pennsylvania, where their grandchildren chiefly reside at present, on the branches of the Skippack and Perkiomen rivulets, in the upper, middle, and lower end of Montgomery, lower east part of Berks, and south corner of Lehigh.

On their first arrival in Pennsylvania they held a “festival in grateful memory of all mercies and divine favours, manifested toward them by the Father of mercies;” on which occasion, Father Senior George Wise, their pastor, conducted the solemnities. This commemorative festival has since 1734 been annually observed by their descendants. Father Wise laboured in sacred things but six years amongst them in Pennsylvania; he departed this life in 1740. His successors were the Rev. B. Hoffman, A. Wagner, G. Wiegner, Christopher Schultz, sen., C. Kriebel, C. Hoffman, G. Kriebel, Mr. Kriebel, Mr. Schultz, B. Schultz, A. Schultz, and D. Schultz, assistants; I. Shultz, and last, the Rev. C. Shultz, who died in March, 1843, aged 66 years. The latter was the grandson of the Rev. Christopher Shultz, sen., of Hereford, who was distinguished as a scholar, and writer; he was the author of their excellent Catechism, Compendium of Christian Doctrine and Faith, and Hymn Book. The late Rev. C. Schultz was much esteemed, as a sound divine, and a man of undoubted piety, by all surrounding denominations. And on account of his devotedness and his eloquence, he was repeatedly called by the Reformed, Moravians, Mennonites, and others, to preach to them the gospel of everlasting salvation. His motto was “*Soli Deo Gloria, et Veritas vincet.*”

The present young candidates in the gospel ministry of the upper district, in Berks county, are the Rev. Joshua Schultz and William Schultz. In the middle and lower districts, the Rev. B. and A. Huebner, and Rev. David Kriebel of Worcester, Montgomery county.

Their pastors are chosen by casting lots; but after being chosen great attention is paid to their education: they are instructed in all the necessary branches pertaining to the gospel ministry.

They number at present about three hundred families; eight hundred members; have five churches and school-houses. They form a respectable part of the German community of the counties above named. Some of them pursue agriculture, some manufactures, others are engaged in commercial enterprise. By their strict church discipline, they keep their members orderly, and pure from the contaminating influence of the corruptions so prevalent. They are a moral people; pious and highly esteemed by all who know them. They pay great attention to the education, the religious and moral training of their children. Many of them possess a respectable knowledge of the learned languages, Latin, &c. There is scarce a family among them that does not possess a well selected and neatly arranged library, among which you find manuscript copies from their learned forefathers of the size of Mell's, or Erasmus Weichenhan's Postill, which they hold sacred on account of the purity of doctrine contained therein.

In order fully to carry out their excellent arrangements, an election is held among them annually, in May, either for elders, or trustees of schools, or overseers of their poor, and sometimes other officers. They have not long since had their literary and charity funds incorporated, entrusted to a number of trustees and others, constituting a body corporate. Church meetings are held, when young and old attend, every Sunday forenoon, once in the upper, and once in the middle or lower district; and every other Sunday afternoon, catechetical instruction is held, indoctrinating the young and old in the truths of the gospel. Their marriages and funerals are conducted as becomes Christians, upon strict temperance principles. At present, all teaching or preaching is principally, if not wholly, conducted in the German language.

We introduce here what might, perhaps, have been more appropriately mentioned before. There is an existing ordinance among us not common with other Christian denominations: the ordinance respects infants. As soon as a child is born, a preacher or minister is called in to pray for the happiness and prosperity of the child, admonishing the parents to educate their tender offspring; to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, according to the will of God. Parents generally bring their little ones into the house of worship, where the same service is performed; praying, and singing some appropriate verses. We hold the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin.

SECOND ADVENT BELIEVERS.

BY N. SOUTHARD,
EDITOR OF THE MIDNIGHT CRY.

THE belief that Christ's personal return precedes the Millennium has been held by Christians in all ages; but it has been accompanied by a belief that those descendants of Abraham, erroneously called Jews, would be either gathered to Palestine or converted, or both, before that coming. Within the last fifty years, the great principle that the New Testament, is an infallible key to the Old, has led to the hearty adoption of the truth that "he is not a Jew who is one outwardly," that those "who are Christ's are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," inasmuch as "the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and OF THE SAME BODY, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel," and that those are truly "the circumcision, who worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Hence, those who *have* "confidence in the flesh," and rest their hopes in a lineal descent from Abraham, have no share in the promises to the true Israel, but "*all* Israel, shall be saved."

Among the rejecters of modern Judaism which gives the promises to those who say they are the seed of Abraham, but are not the true seed, William Miller is prominent. The following is a statement of the views advocated in the Second Advent publications.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES ON WHICH THE SECOND ADVENT CAUSE IS BASED.

1. The word of God teaches that this earth is to be regenerated in the restitution of all things, and restored to its Eden state as it came from the hand of its Maker before the fall, and is to be the eternal abode of the righteous in their resurrection state.

2. The only Millennium found in the word of God, is the one thousand years which are to intervene between the first and second resurrections as brought to view in the 20th of Revelations. And the various portions of scripture which are adduced as evidence of such a period

in time, are to have their fulfilment only in the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

3. The only restoration of Israel yet future, is the restoration of the saints to the new earth, when the Lord my God shall come, and all his saints with him.

4. The signs which were to precede the coming of our Saviour, have all been given; and the prophecies have all been fulfilled but those which relate to the coming of Christ, the end of the world, and the restitution of all things.

5. There are none of the prophetic periods, as we understand them, extending beyond the (Jewish) year 1843, (which terminates in the spring of 1844.)

The above we shall ever maintain as the immutable truths of the word of God, and therefore, till our Lord come, we shall ever look for his return as the next event in historical prophecy.

Those who hold substantially the above views, are found in the greatest numbers in the United States, but the doctrine has been promulgated in the four quarters of the globe. Wm. Miller commenced lecturing in 1831, and his views were published about the same time, in the Vermont Telegraph. To meet the calls for information, he collected these articles in a pamphlet, which he distributed gratuitously. One edition of his lectures was published in 1836. Early in 1840, Joshua V. Himes, a minister in the Christian connexion, became a believer in these views, and commenced the Signs of the Times, issuing it for nearly two years only once in two weeks; it is now weekly. It commenced without subscribers or funds, but gradually gained friends. Other works were issued, and their circulation steadily increased. Josiah Litch, a member of the New England Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, had in 1838, published a book on the "Probability of the Second Coming of Christ about the year 1843." In 1842, he issued "Prophetic Expositions," in two volumes. The Midnight Cry was commenced in New York, in Nov. 1842, and continued daily for twenty-six numbers, and is now weekly. It has been sent to every post office in the United States, and has excited an interest in the Middle and Western States, like that which the Signs had been the means of awakening in New England. Charles Fitch, formerly a pastor of the Free Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J., wrote his "Reasons for believing the Second Advent of Christ in 1843," when he was at Haverhill, Mass., in Nov. 1841. A paper called "The Second Advent of Christ" was commenced by him at Cleveland, about the close of 1842. George Storrs commenced preaching the Second Advent Faith, in the summer of 1842. His

lectures are many of them published in a pamphlet called *Bible Examiner*. Enoch Jacobs, a Methodist Protestant preacher, stationed at Attorney Street, New York, advocated the Second Advent Faith in the *New York Luminary*, in 1842. He has continued his labours in New York, and at Cincinnati, where he is continuing the *Western Midnight Cry*, a weekly paper, commenced by George Storrs. The books and pamphlets of William Miller, Josiah Litch, G. F. Cox, Charles Fitch, George Storrs, L. D. Fleming, S. Bliss, J. B. Cook, F. G. Brown, N. Hervey, and others, are embodied in forty successive numbers of the Second Advent Library. The writings of Lewis Hersey, have been widely circulated in newspaper form. Several millions of books, papers, and tracts have been issued. Their circulation has been chiefly in the United States and Canadas; but considerable quantities have been sent to England. The *Voice of Elijah*, published at Montreal, circulates in the British dominions both sides of the Atlantic. Tracts have been translated into French and German. They have been sent, in English, to all the missionary stations known, and carried by whaling vessels to the remotest parts. Several hundreds of preachers constantly promulgate these views. The number of believers cannot be ascertained. They are every where a minority. If the world generally embraced these views that fact would prove them false, for at Christ's second coming, it shall be as it was in the days of Noah; and Christ's question, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" clearly implies that true faith will be very far from universal.

SYNOPSIS OF MILLER'S VIEWS.

I. I believe Jesus Christ will come again to this earth.

Proof.—John xiv. 3: And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

Acts i. 11: Which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven.

1 Thess. iv. 16: For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first.

Rev. i. 7: Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen.

II. I believe he will come in all the glory of his Father.

Proof.—Matthew xvi. 27 : For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels ; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.

Mark viii. 38 : Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels.

III. I believe he will come in the clouds of heaven.

Proof.—Matthew xxiv. 30 : And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven ; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory.

Mark xiii. 26 : And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds, with great power and glory ; xiv. 62 : And Jesus said, * * * ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

Daniel vii. 13 : I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.

IV. I believe he will then receive his kingdom, which will be eternal.

Proof.—Daniel vii. 14 : And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him : his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed.

Luke xix. 12, 15 : He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded those servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading.

2 Tim. iv. 1 : I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.

V. I believe the saints will then possess the kingdom for ever.

Proof.—Daniel vii. 18, 22, and 27 : But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for

ever and ever. Until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.

Matthew xxv. 34: Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.

Luke xii. 32; xxii. 29: Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me.

1 Cor. ix. 25: And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we, an incorruptible.

2 Tim. iv. 8: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.

James i. 12: Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.

1 Peter v. 4: And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

VI. I believe at Christ's second coming the body of every departed saint will be raised, like Christ's glorious body.

Proof.—1 Cor. xv. 20, 23, 49: But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.

1 John iii. 2: Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.

VII. I believe that the righteous who are living on the earth when he comes, will be changed from mortal to immortal bodies, and with them who are raised from the dead, will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so be for ever with the Lord.

Proof.—1 Cor. xv. 51-53: Behold, I show you a mystery: we

shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.

Philip. iii. 20, 21: For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

1 Thess. iv. 14-17: For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.

VIII. I believe the saints will then be presented to God blameless, without spot or wrinkle, in love.

Proof.—1 Cor. iv. 14: Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise us up also by Jesus, and shall present us with you.

Eph. v. 27: That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

Col. i. 22: In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy, and unblamable, and unreprouvable in his sight.

Jude 24: Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy.

1 Thess. iii. 13: To the end he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.

1 Cor. i. 7, 8: So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

IX. I believe when Christ comes the second time, he will come to finish the controversy of Zion, to deliver his children from all bondage,

to conquer their last enemy, and to deliver them from the power of the tempter, which is the devil.

Proof.—Deut. xxv. 1: If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked.

Isa. xxxiv. 8; xl. 2, 5; xli. 10 to 12: For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins. And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded; they shall be as nothing; and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them, and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee: they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought.

Rom. viii. 21 to 23: Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.

Heb. ii. 13 to 15: And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold, I, and the children which God hath given me. Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

1 Cor. xv. 24, 26: So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.

Rev. xx. 1 to 6: And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the

bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season. And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.

X. I believe that when Christ comes he will destroy the bodies of the living wicked by fire, as those of the old world were destroyed by water, and shut up their souls in the pit of wo, until their resurrection unto damnation.

Proof.—Ps. l. 3; xcvii. 3: Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence: a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about.

Isa. lxvi. 15, 16: For behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh; and the slain of the Lord shall be many.

Dan. vii. 10: A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened.

Mal. iv. 1: For behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.

Matt. iii. 12: Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. Ibid. xiii. 41–42; 49–50: The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity;

and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

1 Cor. iii. 13: Every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.

1 Thess. v. 2, 3: For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child: and they shall not escape.

2 Thess. i. 7-9: And to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.

1 Pet. i. 7: That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ.

2 Pet. iii. 7, 10: But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up.

Isa. xxiv. 21, 22: And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited.

Jude 6, 7; 14, 15: And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment

upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.

Rev. xx. 3, 13, 14, 15 : And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled ; and after that he must be loosed a little season. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it ; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them ; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

John v. 29 : And shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.

Acts xxiv. 15 : And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.

XI. I believe, when the earth is cleansed by fire, that Christ and his saints will then take possession of the earth, and dwell therein for ever. Then the kingdom will be given to the saints.

Proof.—Ps. xxxvii. 9–11, 22, 28, 29, 34 : For evil-doers shall be cut off : but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth. For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be : yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be. But the meek shall inherit the earth ; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace. For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth ; and they that be cursed of him shall be cut off. For the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints ; they are preserved for ever : but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off. The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein for ever. Wait on the Lord, and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land : when the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it.

Prov. ii. 21–22 ; x. 30 : For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it. But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it. The righteous shall never be removed : but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth.

Isa. lx. 21 : Thy people also shall be all righteous : they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified.

Matt. v. 5: Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

Rev. v. 10: And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.

XII. I believe the time is appointed of God when these things shall be accomplished.

Proof.—Acts xvii. 31: Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained: whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.

Job vii. 1; xiv. 14: Is there not an appointed time to man upon earth? are not his days also like the days of a hireling? If a man die, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come.

Ps. lxxxi. 3: Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, in the time appointed, on our solemn feast-day.

Isa. xl. 2: Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins. (See margin.)

Dan. viii. 19; x. 1; xi. 35: And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation; for at the time appointed the end shall be. In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision. And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet for a time appointed.

Hab. ii. 3: For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry.

Acts xvii. 26: And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitations. (See Gal. iv.)

XIII. I believe God has revealed the time.

Proof.—Isa. xlv. 7, 8; xlv. 20, 21: And who, as I shall call, and shall declare it, and set it in order for me, since I appointed the ancient people? and the things that are coming, and shall come, let them show unto them. Assemble yourselves and come; draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations; they have no knowledge that set up

the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god that cannot save. Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, and let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? who hath told it from that time? have not I the Lord? and there is no God else besides me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none besides me.

Dan. xii. 10: Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.

Amos iii. 7: Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.

1 Thess. v. 4: But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.

XIV. I believe many who are professors and preachers will never believe or know the time until it comes upon them.

Proof.—Jer. viii. 7: Yea, the stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle, and the crane, and swallow, observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the judgment of the Lord.

Matt. xxiv. 50: The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of.

Jer. xxv. 34-37: Howl, ye shepherds, and cry; and wallow yourselves in the ashes, ye principal of the flock: for the days of your slaughter and of your dispersions are accomplished: and ye shall fall like a pleasant vessel. And the shepherds shall have no way to flee, nor the principal of the flock to escape. A voice of the cry of the shepherds, and an howling of the principal of the flock, shall be heard; for the Lord hath spoiled their pasture. And the peaceable habitations are cut down because of the fierce anger of the Lord.

XV. I believe the wise, they who are to shine as the brightness of the firmament, (Dan. xii. 3,) will understand the time.

Proof.—Eccl. viii. 5: Whoso keepeth the commandment shall feel no evil thing: and a wise man's heart discerneth both time and judgment.

Dan. xii. 10: Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.

Matt. xxiv. 43-45; xxv. 4, 6-10: But know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken

up. Therefore be ye also ready : for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh. Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat, in due season ? But the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the Bridegroom cometh ; go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil : for our lamps are gone out. But the wise answered, saying, Not so ; lest there be not enough for us and you ; but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. And while they went to buy, the Bridegroom came ; and they that were ready, went in with him to the marriage : and the door was shut.

1 Thess. v. 4 : But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.

1 Pet. i. 9-13 : Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you. Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you, by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven ; which things the angels desire to look into. Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

XVI. I believe the time can be known by all who desire to understand and to be ready for his coming. And I am fully convinced that some time between March 21st, 1843, and March 21st, 1844, according to the Jewish mode of computation of time, Christ will come, and bring all his saints with him ; and that then he will reward every man as his works shall be.

Proof.—Matt. xvi. 27 : For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels ; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.

Rev. xxii. 12 : And behold, I come quickly ; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his works shall be.

TIME PROVED IN FIFTEEN DIFFERENT WAYS.

I. I prove it by the time given by Moses, in the 26th chapter of Leviticus, being seven times that the people of God are to be in bondage to the kingdoms of this world; or in Babylon, literal and mystical; which seven times cannot be understood less than seven times 360 revolutions of the earth in its orbit, making 2520 years. I believe this began according to Jeremiah xv. 4, "And I will cause them to be removed into all kingdoms of the earth, because of Manasseh, the son of Hezekiah, king of Judah, for that which he did in Jerusalem," and Isa. vii. 8, "For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Resin: and within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people,"—when Manasseh was carried captive to Babylon, and Israel was no more a nation,—see chronology, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 9, "So Manasseh made Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to err, and to do worse than the heathen, whom the Lord had destroyed before the children of Israel,"—the 677th year B. C. Then take 677 out of 2520, leaves A. D. 1843, when the punishment of the people of God will end. (See *Miller's Lectures*, p. 251.)

II. It is proved typically by the year of release. See Deut. xv. 1, 2: "At the end of every seven years thou shalt make a release; and this is the manner of the release; every creditor that lendeth ought unto his neighbour shall release it; he shall not exact it of his neighbour or of his brother, because it is called the Lord's release." Also Jer. xxiv. 14: "At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother a Hebrew, which hath been sold unto thee, and when he hath served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee; but your fathers hearkened not unto me, neither inclined their ear." We are, by this type, taught that the people of God will be delivered from their servitude and bondage, when they have served their 7 prophetic years. 7 times 360 years is 2520. Beginning with the captivity of Israel and the king of Judah, Manasseh, 677 B. C., must end in A. D. 1843, when the children of God will be released from all bondage and slavery. (See *Second Advent Library*, No. 14.)

III. It is also proved by the seven years' war of Zion with her enemies, given to us in Ezekiel xxxix. 9, 10: "And they that dwell in the cities of Israel shall go forth, and shall set on fire and burn the weapons, both the shields and bucklers, the bows and the arrows, and the handstaves, and the spears, and they shall burn them with fire seven years: so that they shall take no wood out of the field, neither cut down any out of the forests; for they shall burn the weapons with

fire; and they shall spoil those that spoiled them, and rob those that robbed them, saith the Lord God." The children of God will be contending with their enemies, spoiling those that spoiled them, and robbing those that robbed them, 7 years, prophetic, which is 2520 common years. Beginning as before, when Babylon began to spoil and rob them, and when they by the fire of the truth began to burn up the weapons of their enemies, in this moral warfare; this will end in 1843. (See *Miller's Life and Views*, p. 69.)

IV. It is proved, also, by the sign of the Sabbath. Exod. xxxi. 13-17: "Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations: that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore: for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done, but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath-day he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." Heb. iv. 4, 9-11: "For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise: And God did rest the seventh day from all his works." "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his. Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief."

As God was six days creating the old heavens and earth, and rested on the seventh: so it is a sign that Christ will also labour six days in creating the new heavens and earth, and rest on the seventh. How long is a day with the Lord? Peter tells us in his 2 Epistle iii. 8: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." If, then, a thousand years is a day with the Lord, how long has Christ been to work creating the new? I answer, if we will allow the Bible to make us a chronology, we shall find this year, 1843, the 6000 years from Adam's fall will be finished. Then the antitypical Sabbath of a 1000 years will commence. Rev. xx. 6: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of

Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." (See *Life and Views*, p. 157.)

V. Again, we can prove it by the typical jubilee. Levit. xxv. 8-13: "And thou shalt number seven Sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven Sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound, on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family. A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you; ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, nor gather the grapes in it of thy vine undressed. For it is the jubilee; it shall be holy unto you, ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field. In the year of this jubilee, ye shall return every man unto his possession." Now, if we can show any rule whereby we can find the antitype, we can tell when the people of God will come into the inheritance of the purchased possession, and the redemption of their bodies, and the trump of jubilee will proclaim liberty, a glorious one, through all the land. In order to do this we must take notice of the order of the Sabbaths. "Seven Sabbaths shall be complete." There are seven kinds of Sabbaths, which all have seven for a given number.

The Jews kept but six Sabbaths; if they had kept the seventh they would have been made perfect without us; but they broke the seventh. "Therefore there remains a keeping of the Sabbath to the people of God." The Jewish Sabbaths were:

1. The 7th day. Exod. xxxi. 15.
2. The 50th day. Levit. xxiii. 15, 16.
3. The 7th week. Deut. xvi. 9.
4. The 7th month. Levit. xxiii. 24, 25.
5. The 7th year. Levit. xxv. 3, 4.
6. The 7 times 7 years and 50th year Jubilee.
7. The 7 times 7 Jubilees and 50th Jubilee will bring us to a complete or perfect Sabbath,—the great Jubilee of Jubilees. Thus 7 times 7, 50 years is 49 times 50 = 2450 years.

It is very evident no year of release or Jubilee was ever kept after the reign of Josiah, the last king of Jerusalem that obeyed the commandments of the Lord, or kept his statutes. This king's reign ended B. C. 607. See 2 Kings 23d chapter, 2 Chron. 35 and 36 chapters, and Jeremiah 22d chapter. After which the Jews never kept, neither

could they keep, a year of release, or Jubilee; for neither their kings, their nobles, their people, or their lands could have been redeemed after this. Jer. xlv. 20-23. Here ended the Jewish Jubilees, when they had not kept more than 21 Jubilees, lacking 28 of coming to the great Jubilee.

And now the land was to lay desolate, while the people of God were in their enemies' land. Levit. xxvi. 34. How long is a Jubilee of Jubilees? Ans. 49 times 50 years = 2450 years. When did these years begin? Ans. When the Jews ceased the keeping of the Sabbaths and Jubilees, at the close of Josiah's reign, B. C. 607. Take 607 from 2450, it leaves A. D. 1843; when the Jubilee of Jubilees will come. (See *Sec. Adv. Lib.*, No. 14.)

VI. I prove it by Hosea vi. 1-3: "Come, and let us return unto the Lord; for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up. After two days will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight. Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord; his going forth is prepared as the morning; and he shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth." This prophecy is the two days of the Roman kingdom, in its Imperial, Kingly, and Papal form, with its great iron teeth, tearing and persecuting the people of God; the third day is the same as Rev. xx. 6: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years;" when the people of God will live in his sight, "live and reign with him a thousand years." If, then, the third day is a thousand years, then the two days are of equal length. When did the two days begin? Ans. When the Jews made a league with the Romans. See Hosea v. 13: "When Ephraim saw his sickness, and Judah saw his wound, then went Ephraim to the Assyrian, and sent to king Jareb: yet could he not heal you, nor cure you of your wound." Dan. xi. 23: "And after the league made with him, he shall work deceitfully; for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people." 1 Maccabees, 8th and 9th chapters. This league was confirmed and ratified, and the Grecian kingdom ceased to rule over God's people B. C. 158 years. Then add 158 to 1842, and we have 2000 years, or two days; as Peter says, 2 Peter iii. 8: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." And 1843 is the first year in the third thousand years, or third day of the Lord. The world has stood since the fall of man 2000 years under the Patriarchs; 2000 years under the Assyrian, Baby-

lonian, Medo-Persian, and Grecian; and 2000 years under Rome Pagan, Papal and Kingly. (See *Sec. Adv. Lib. No. 3*, p. 45.)

VII. I can prove it by the length of the vision which Daniel had, (viii. 1-14,) of the ram, he-goat, and little horn, which Daniel was informed was 2300 days long. Dan. viii. 13, 14: "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot. And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." And from which the 70 weeks were *cut off*, and fulfilled, the year of Christ's death. Dan. ix. 20-27. Then 70 weeks of years being cut off from 2300 days, makes these days years; and 490 years being fulfilled in A. D. 33, leaves 1810 years to the fulfilment of the vision, which added to 33 makes 1843, when the sanctuary will be cleansed, and the people of God justified. (See *Miller's Lectures*, p. 73.)

VIII. It can be proved by Daniel xii. 6, 7: "And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders? And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swear by him that liveth for ever, that it shall be for a time, times, and a half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." The question is asked, How long to the end of these wonders? These wonders are to the resurrection. See 2d and 3d verses: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever." The answer is given by the angel, who informs Daniel it shall be for a time, times, and a half, and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all will be finished. Eze. xii. 10-15: "Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: This burden concerneth the prince in Jerusalem, and all the house of Israel that are among them. Say, I am your sign: like as I have done, so shall it be done unto them: they shall remove and go into captivity. And the prince that is among them shall bear upon his shoulders in the twilight, and shall go forth: they shall dig through the wall to carry out thereby: he shall cover his face, that he see not the ground with his eyes. My net also will I spread upon him, and he shall be taken in my snare:

and I will bring him to Babylon, to the land of the Chaldeans, yet shall he not see it, though he shall die there. And I will scatter toward every wind all that are about him to help him, and all his bands; and I will draw out the sword after them. And they shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall scatter them among the nations, and disperse them in the countries." Jer. xv. 4: "And I will cause them to be removed into all kingdoms of the earth, because of Manasseh the son of Hezekiah, king of Judah, for that which he did in Jerusalem." This scattering begun, when Israel was scattered by Esarhaddon, and when the king of Judah, Manasseh, was carried to Babylon, B. C. 677. Thus they continued to be a people scattered, by the kings of the earth, until they fled into the wilderness in A. D. 538, which makes 1215 years. There they remained in the wilderness a time, times, and a half—which began A. D. 538, and continued until A. D. 1798. The kings of the earth then had power, and the time, times, and a half of the scattering of the holy people is filled up by 45 years, being the remainder of the 1215, making in all 1260 years, under the nations or kings, and ending in the year 1843,—which is the fulness of times. Eph. i. 7, 10: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him:"—when the people of God, both among Jews and Gentiles, will no more be scattered, but gathered in one body in Christ. (See *Sec. Adv. Lib.* No. 6, p. 45.)

IX. It can also be proved by Daniel xii. 11–13: "And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."

The number 1335 days, from the taking away of Rome Pagan, A. D. 508, to set up Rome Papal, and the reign of Papacy, is 1290 days, which was exactly fulfilled in 1290 years, being fulfilled in 1798. This proves the 1335 days to be years, and that Daniel will stand in his lot in A. D. 1843. For proof texts, see Dan. xi. 31: "And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." 2 Thess. ii. 6–8: "And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in

his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work : only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Job xix. 25 : " For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." (See *Miller's Lectures*, p. 100.)

X. It can also be proved by the words of Christ, Luke xiii. 32 : " And he said unto them, Go ye and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected." These two days, in which Christ casts out devils and does cures, are the same as Hosea's two days, at the end of which, the devil will be chained, and cast out of the earth into the pit, and shut up. This will take 2000 years of the Roman power. Rev. xii. 9 : " And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world : he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." And then the people of God will be perfected. Rev. xx. 9 : " Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection : on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

This time began with the "great dragon," Rev. xii. 3 : " And there appeared another wonder in heaven ; and behold, a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth : and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born."

This government will draw after him one third part of the time, which wicked men have power in the earth, viz., 6000 years ; and the 7000th, the year Christ will take possession and reign with his saints, in perfect bliss.

This dragon power began its power over the saints when the league was made with him, B. C. 158,—and will end in 1842. Then the third day will begin 1843. (See *Sec. Ad. Lib.* No. 3, page 61.)

XI. The trumpets are also a revelation of time. See Rev. ix. 5 : " And to them it was given that they should not kill them, but that they should be tormented five months : and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion, when he striketh a man." These five months began when the Turks made incursions into the Greek territories, according to Gibbon, in the year 1299, on the 27th day of July. 5 months is 150 years, $5 \times 30 = 150$. This trumpet ended 1449. And

the sixth trumpet began to sound, and was to sound 391 years and 15 days, as in Rev. ix. 15: "And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men;" and ended 1840, on the 11th of August. Then the seventh trumpet begins, and ends with the fulness of times. Rev. x. 5, 7: "And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth, lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer: but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." And synchronizes with Daniel xii. 7. See section 7, where it is shown to end in the year 1843. (See *Miller's Lectures*, p. 190.)

XII. It can be proved by the two witnesses being clothed in sackcloth 1260 years. See Rev. xi. 3: "And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth." This time began with Papacy, 538, and ended in 1798, during which time the Bible was suppressed from the laity, in all the countries where Papacy had power, until the laws of the Papal hierarchy were abolished and free toleration was granted to the Papal States in 1798. Then the remainder harmonizes with the trumpets: see Rev. xi. 14, 15: "The second wo is past; and behold the third wo cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." And terminates with A. D. 1843. (See *Miller's Lectures*, p. 190.)

XIII. It can be proved by Rev. xii. 6, 14: "And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days. And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent." It is evident that the Church is not now in the wilderness, for if so, she must have been there in the apostles' days, for she enjoys more liberty now among the nations, than in any previous time since the gospel was preached; and it is very evident, for ages past, the true Church has been an outlaw among the kingdoms which arose out of the Roman Empire. The Church was driven into the wilderness, where they were given into the power of the Pope,—Daniel vii.

25: "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time,"—in the year A.D. 538; and was in the wilderness 1260 years, until 1798, when free toleration was granted in the kingdoms in the Papal territory. This also harmonizes with the *witnesses* and the *trumpet*. Compare Rev. xi. 15, "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever," with Rev. xii. 10, "And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down which accused them before our God day and night." (See *Miller's Lectures*, p. 20.)

XIV. It is proved by Rev. xiii. 5: "And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months." This time began at the same time as the preceding, when power was given to the Pope by Justinian, A. D. 538, and lasted until the Pope was carried into captivity, and his power abolished, in the year 1798. See 10th verse: "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." This beast is the same as the little horn in Daniel 7th, and synchronizes with Daniel's "*abomination that maketh desolate*," or "*that astonisheth*," (see marginal reading.) Compare Daniel xi. 31, and xii. 11, with Rev. xiii. 3–8; and of course his power is abolished with the end of his "setting up," and the 1290 years. Then Daniel xii. 12,—"Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days," carries us to the year 1843. (See *Miller's Lectures*, p. 77.)

XV. It can be proved by the numbers in Rev. xiii. 18: "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three-score and six," connected with Daniel xii. 12, as before quoted. This text shows the number of years that Rome would exist under the blasphemous head of Paganism, after it was connected with the people of God by league; beginning B. C. 158, add 666 years, will bring us to A. D. 508, when the daily sacrifice was taken away. Then add, Daniel xii. 12, the 1335 to 508, makes the year 1843. When the beast and his image will be tormented in the presence of the holy angels, and the Lamb. See Rev. xiv. 9–12: "And the third angel

followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." (See *Miller's Lectures*, p. 76.)

These several ways of prophetic chronology prove the end in 1843. Now what is there in all this reckoning of time, that should entitle one to such vile abuse and slander, as I have received from the pulpit and press, from editors and priests, from the infidel and blasphemer, from the drunkard and gambler? These have all made friends with each other, for the sole purpose of vilifying and saying hard things against me for presenting my honest conviction of these things. If men are satisfied that these things are not true, why are they so violent and denunciatory against me? What can I do? I can neither make it true nor false. Why do professed ministers show such anger and malice? Why call me a *prophet*, in such sneering terms, from Dr. Brownlee down to John Dowling, A. M. pastor, &c. &c. &c.? I have only shown to the world my opinion on those passages: they have done the same. I have shown my faith by my works: they can do likewise if they please. Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind, and so let them speak.

But these men not only show much anger, but misrepresent my words and views. Is truth of such a texture, as to need lies to support it? If they have no better foundation for their religion, than they have manifested in their debates on this subject, I should think they might be sentimentally opposed to the coming of Christ, and upon the very same principle as the infidel or drunkard would oppose,—Not ready.

I would advise all to cease their revilings, take this little tract, read, and compare scripture with scripture, prophecy with history, and see if there is not a strong probability that I am correct; and if there is even one to ten, that it is so, then it is all-important we attend to the interest of our souls and eternity. You ought to spurn from you those who say there is no danger; you ought in justice to your own soul, turn a deaf ear to the men who are flattering you with "peace and safety."

Who will this day overtake as a thief? Surely not those who are looking for it. 1 Thess. v. 4; Heb. ix. 28. Who will be destroyed when it comes? Those who are overtaken as a thief. 1 Thess. v. 3; Matt. xxiv. 50; Rev. xvi. 15. You ask, will all who do not look for him, perish in the day of his coming? I answer, it would seem so, by many texts of scripture. Yet I am not their judge. God only knows what will become of them. They that were ready went in with him, and the door was shut.

WILLIAM MILLER.

UNITED BRETHREN IN CHRIST.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM HANBY,

CIRCLEVILLE, OHIO.

THIS denomination took its rise in the United States, about the year 1755, and is distinguished from the Old United Brethren or Moravian Church, by the additional phrase of "In Christ."

In 1752, William Otterbein, a distinguished German divine, came to America, being at that time a minister of the German Reformed Church; he soon became convinced, after his arrival in this country, of the necessity of a deeper work of grace being wrought on his heart than he had ever, as yet, received. He accordingly rested not, day nor night, until he found the Lord precious to his soul, in the full and free pardon of all his sins. He immediately commenced preaching the doctrines of a spiritual and holy life. After having been persecuted for some years, for preaching the doctrines of the Reformation, he virtually withdrew from his mother church, and commenced labouring for the conversion of souls in connexion with two German divines by the name of Boehm and Geeting, who had also deeply engaged in the work of Reformation. In 1771, Messrs. Asbury and Wright, came over from England, under the direction of the Rev. J. Wesley, and commenced as co-workers with these German brethren; and so united were they at that time, in their labours of love, that one branch was called "Methodist," and the other "German Methodist;" though the German brethren, at that time anticipated an organization of their own. In 1784, at the request of the Rev. F. Asbury, William Otterbein, assisted Dr. Coke, in his (Asbury's) ordination, who was the first bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church in America.

The number of German Brethren increased rapidly, and numerous societies were formed, and the gracious work spread through the states of Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia. Great meetings were appointed annually, and on these occasions Otterbein would lay

before the Brethren, the importance of the ministry, and the necessity of their utmost endeavours to save souls.

At one of these meetings, it was resolved that a conference should be held, in order to take into consideration, how, and in what manner they might be most useful.

The first conference was accordingly held in the city of Baltimore, Md., in 1789. The following preachers were present:

William Otterbein, Martin Boehm, George A. Geeting, Christian Newcomer, Adam Lohman, John Ernst, Henry Weidner.

In the mean time, the number of members continued to increase, and the preachers were obliged to appoint an annual conference, in order to unite themselves more closely, and labour more successfully in the vineyard of the Lord; for some were Presbyterians or German Reformed, some were Lutherans, others Mennonites, and some few Methodists. They accordingly appointed an annual conference, which convened in Maryland, in 1800. They there united themselves into a society which bears the name of "United Brethren in Christ," and elected William Otterbein and Martin Boehm, as superintendents or bishops; and agreed that each should act according to his own convictions as to the mode of baptism. The rapid increase of members and ministers was such, that the want of some general regulations, by which all should be governed, was deeply felt, for, as yet, they had no Discipline. It was resolved that a General Conference should be held to accomplish that object, in a manner not derogatory to the word of God. The members of this conference were to be elected from among the preachers, by a vote of the members throughout the whole society in general.

The conference was accordingly held in 1815, at Mount Pleasant, Pennsylvania, and after mature deliberation, a Discipline was presented containing the doctrines and rules for the government of the church.

As William Otterbein was the principal instrument under God, in founding the Brethren Church, a few remarks in reference to this good man, may not be out of place here. He was born in Nassau Dillingburg, Germany, on the 6th day of March, 1726, and died November 17th, 1813, in the 88th year of his age. He resided 26 years in Germany, and 61 years in America; all of which latter term he laboured in the ministry. He was considered a ripe scholar in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Philosophy and Divinity. The following is a specimen of the exalted views entertained by Bishop Asbury, of this divine: "Is father Otterbein dead? Great and good man of God! An honour to his church and country; one of the greatest scholars and divines that ever came to America, or born in it. Alas, the chiefs of the

Germans are gone to their rest and reward—taken from the evil to come.” (*Asbury’s Letter*, under date of Nov. 1813.)

The same reverend gentleman, in preaching the funeral sermon of Martin Beohm, in the same year, speaks thus of Otterbein: “Pre-eminent among these, is William Otterbein, who assisted in the ordination of your speaker, to the superintendency of the Methodist Episcopal Church. William Otterbein was regularly ordained to the ministry in the German Presbyterian Church. He is one of the best scholars and greatest divines in America. Why then is he not where he began?” (alluding to his having to leave his old church because of persecution.) “Alas for us,” says the bishop, “the zealous are necessarily so, those whose cry has been, ‘*Put me into the priest’s office, that I may eat a morsel of bread!*’ Osterwald has observed, ‘*Hell is full of the skulls of unfaithful ministers!*’ Such was not Beohm, such is not Otterbein; and now, his sun of life is setting in brightness; behold, the saint of God leaning upon his staff waiting for the chariots of Israel.”

DOCTRINES.

The doctrines of the Brethren Church, may be summed up in the following items:

1st. They believe in the only true God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; that these three are one, the Father in the Son, the Son in the Father, and the Holy Ghost equal in essence or being with both. That this triune God created the heavens and the earth, and all that in them is, visible as well as invisible, and sustains, governs and supports the same.

2d. They believe in Jesus Christ, that he is very God and man; that he became incarnate by the Holy Ghost in the Virgin Mary, and was born of her; that he is the Saviour and Mediator of the whole human race, if they with full faith accept the grace proffered in Jesus. That this Jesus suffered and died on the cross for us; was buried and rose again on the third day, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God to intercede for us, and that he shall come again at the last day to judge the quick and dead.

3d. They believe in the Holy Ghost; that he is equal in being with the Father and Son; and that he comforts the faithful, and guides them into all truth.

4th. They believe in a Holy Christian Church, the communion of saints, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting.

5th. They believe that the Holy Bible, Old and New Testaments,

is the word of God ; that it contains the only true way to our salvation ; that every true Christian is bound to receive it with the influence of the Spirit of God, as the only rule and guide ; that without faith in Jesus Christ, true repentance, forgiveness of sins, and following after Christ, no one can be a true Christian.

6th. They believe that the fall in Adam and redemption through Jesus Christ, shall be preached throughout the world.

7th. They believe also, that the ordinances, namely : baptism and the remembrance of the sufferings and death of Christ, are to be in use, and practised by all Christian societies, but the manner of which ought always to be left to the judgment of every individual. The example of washing the saints' feet is left to the judgment of all to practise or not.

GOVERNMENT.

As brevity is desired, a few extracts, in substance, from the Constitution and General Rules of the Church, will be sufficient for present purposes.

1st. All ecclesiastical power, to make or repeal any rule of discipline, is vested in a General Conference, which shall consist of elders elected by the lay members of the whole church.

2d. General Conferences shall be held every four years, the bishops to be considered members and presiding officers.

3d. The General Conference shall at every session elect one or more bishops, who shall serve as such for four years only, unless re-elected.

4th. No rule shall be passed at any time, to change the Confession of Faith as it now stands, or do away the itinerant plan.

5th. No rule shall be adopted that will deprive local preachers of membership in annual conferences.

6th. Free-Masonry, in every sense of the word, is totally prohibited and in no way tolerated in the Brethren Church.

7th. All slavery, in every sense of the word, is prohibited. Should any be found in our church, who hold slaves, they cannot continue as members, unless they do personally manumit or set free such slaves.

8th. The vending or distillation of ardent spirits is prohibited in our church, for medical and mechanical purposes excepted ; should any members be found dealing in the unholy traffic, they must desist or cease to be members.

CONFERENCES.

The Brethren Church have three orders of Conferences, to wit: quarterly, annual, and general. A quarterly conference meets every three months; and is composed of all the class-leaders, stewards, exhorters, local and travelling preachers within the bounds of a circuit or station, with the presiding elder at the head, as president.

Annual conferences meet annually, and are composed of all the preachers within the specified bounds thereof, with the bishops as presiding officers. At annual conferences, the labours and moral deportment of all the preachers are examined, the boundaries of circuits and stations defined, applications to the ministry received or rejected, presiding elders elected, preachers stationed, and elders ordained.*

General Conference is the highest tribunal in the church, is the law-making department for the whole body, and is composed of elders elected by the laity of the church. Each annual conference district is allowed to send three delegates to General Conference.

MINISTERS.

The Brethren Church recognises but one order in the ministry, only that of ordained elders, who, by virtue of their ordination, administer the ordinances of God's house, and solemnize the rites of matrimony.

OFFICERS.

Numerous offices are recognised in the church, such as class-leaders, stewards, preachers-in-charge, presiding elders, and bishops.

It is the duty of leaders to attend strictly to the classes assigned them, and meet them once a week for prayer or class meeting, and to admonish their members to lead a holy life.

The duty of stewards is to attend to the pecuniary wants of the ministers.

A preacher-in-charge, supposes two preachers to be on one circuit, and that he has the oversight, and it is his duty to attend to the general regulations of his circuit.

A presiding elder is an officer elected by the annual conference from among the ordained elders, and it is his duty to travel over a specified number of circuits, and hold, as president, quarterly con-

* All candidates for the ministry, after having received license to preach, must stand a probation of three years, before they can be ordained as elders.

ference meetings, four on each circuit a year, and see that all the labourers under his charge, discharge their duty faithfully.

Bishops are general superintendents of the whole church, and preside at all annual and general conferences.

STATISTICS.

At the present time, the statistics of the church stand, as high as can be estimated, as follows, viz. :

Bishops,	-	-	-	-	-	3
Annual Conferences,	-	-	-	-	-	9
Circuits,	-	-	-	-	-	120
Churches,	-	-	-	-	-	1,800
Preachers,	-	-	-	-	-	500
Members,	-	-	-	-	-	65,000

Eight Home Missionary Societies, and one for the benefit of the foreign field; though but little has been done, as yet, for foreign missions.

There are two church periodicals, one German, and the other English. The German is printed in Baltimore, Maryland; the English, in Circleville, Ohio.

Though the Brethren Church is as old as the Methodist Episcopal Church, yet it is comparatively small, owing to the fact, that until within the last twenty years, its religious exercises have all been conducted in the German language exclusively, or nearly so. Within the last twenty years the church has more than doubled its numbers.

REMARKS.

It will be perceived from the foregoing, that the government of the church is founded upon republican principles; that an equal balance of power is secured between the ministry and the laity. That there is a regular gradation from the lowest officer to the highest; and that all the rulers are constituted by the ruled, and by them can be removed at pleasure. The subjects of the ecclesiastical law make their law, and can alter or amend the same as seemeth good to them.

Perhaps no greater evil has ever existed in the Christian Church, than that of an undue power assumed and exercised by the ministry, and no evil should be more strongly guarded against. Preachers are men, in some respects like all other men, and, while on earth, have not ascended up on high; and consequently should have some restraint

thrown around them, as well as others. The church that invests in the hands of the clergy (be their apparent prosperity what it may) the right to make all law, and execute the same uncontrolled, is in danger of that degrading monarchy, which has characterized Papal Rome for ages past.

The particular doctrines which characterize the preaching of the Brethren, are: salvation through faith in the merits of a Saviour, by a true repentance and forgiveness of sins; holiness of heart, life and conversation.

A P P E N D I X.

BY THE REV. H. G. SPOYTH.

The United Brethren in Christ originated from William Otterbein, who was born and brought up by eminently pious parents, who afforded him a classical education—embracing a full study in divinity in Heilbron Europa; where, as well as in this his adopted country, he stood deservedly high as a scholar and a divine, of an unsullied reputation and an able expounder of the word of God. He was solemnly ordained and set apart for the work of the ministry, in the German Reformed Church. In the discharge of his pastoral duties, and in search of that truth which God requires in the inward parts, he found the pearl of great price, and obtained the pentecostal blessing, which was soon after he had entered the sacred office in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. He entertained a holy and exalted view of the magnitude of the ministration of peace, and thought it no light thing to be a spiritual guide. His zeal in the church was great, and his manner of preaching was eloquent, persuasive and clear. Without restraint he sought to carry the truth to the sinner's heart. Many of his hearers became deeply affected, while others were filled with divine consolation. This state of things led him to hold special meetings for prayer, to afford him an opportunity to converse with all the serious persons, particularly on the state of their minds, so he might exhort, comfort, or admonish each, individually, as the case might be. Through William Otterbein prayer meetings were once more revived; for be it remembered, the name as well as the holding of a prayer meeting was a something unknown at that dark day. Thus

the reformation commenced, and with it the rise and progress of the United Brethren in Christ. But this reformation of primitive Christianity brought alike with it its opposition from within and without the church. Here and there pulpits were denied and church doors closed against the so-called new doctrine—the doctrine of repentance and the new birth; and the prayer meetings were, if not violently yet sharply opposed by men professing godliness. Attending a prayer meeting was the signal of reproach and church censure.

Otterbein thought that the people of God were not confined to any particular community; and although there were a division of churches—separated from each other, rather by tradition and non-essential forms than otherwise—yet he believed that the love of God, shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost, is the same wherever it governs the affections, and it alone forms the true bond of Christian fellowship; also freely admitting that there are many such, who, standing within the pales of different denominations, will nevertheless hold themselves spiritually joined in the bonds of Christian love, to all who are partakers with them in the like precious faith; and that they, irrespective of forms or party name, should and may freely meet together around the sacramental table of the Lord's Supper. This again was resisted as by common consent by the different Christian churches and sects, as an innovation in the established order and usage of the time.

His position was now peculiarly trying, and his conflict severe; but he stood, prophet-like, nothing doubting, although single and alone, with a firm resolve to follow the direction of Heaven—complying, with a willing mind, to its high demands—committing himself to the divine protection. He was not, however, suffered long to stand alone. The Lord was pleased to call Martin Beohm, George A. Geeting, Christopher Grosh, Christian Newcomer, Andrew Zeller, George Pfrimer, John Neidig, Joseph Huffman, Jacob Bowlus, and others. The purity and simplicity with which these men preached the word of God, the fervency of spirit that animated them in exhorting the people every where to repent, the love and meekness which characterized their social intercourse with their fellow-men, won for them the esteem and friendship of many; and thus an effectual door was opened unto them for the preaching and defence of the gospel, which no man as yet has been able to shut; and we may truly say, not by might but by my spirit, said the Lord. Very many indeed were made the happy subjects of the converting grace of God.

The number daily increasing, the people assembled themselves for the solemn worship of the Almighty, wherever they could, in private

houses, in barns and groves, in order to afford the preachers, as well as the Brethren generally, an opportunity to meet; and they were then to be found over the states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and what was then called New Virginia. Big meetings were resolved on; the first was held in Lancaster county, Pa. Here perhaps for the first, and for many long years, an assembly of Christians met together from far and near,—Lutherans, German Reformed, Mennonites, Dunkers, and others, coming as with one accord and with one mind. Many of the Brethren were thus for the first time, happily brought together; and as the meeting progressed it increased in interest. Br. Beohm being of small stature, wearing his beard long, dressed in the true costume of a Mennonite; Wm. Otterbein being a large man, showing a prominent forehead, on which one might see the seal of the Lord impressed; when Beohm had just closed a discourse, but before he had time to take his seat, Otterbein rose up, folding Beohm in his arms saying, "We are brethren." At this sight some praised God aloud, but most of the congregation gave place to their feelings by a flood of tears. This meeting, and the peculiar circumstances attending it, under the harmonizing influence of the divine Spirit, in uniting a people of such various pre-existing orders, now again free from party strife and feeling, under the great Head of the Church, gave rise to the name of "United Brethren in Christ." A name which the church, some time after thought proper to adopt.

The dawn and rise of the Brethren as a people, as to time, would take us back to A. D. 1758.

In the main, it was not a secession from, or a disaffection to any particular church, but an ingathering of precious blood-bought souls. Nor was it the offering of another gospel or doctrine, than that of reconciliation, repentance, and the remission of sins—Now while you hear his voice, the preacher cried. Yet all this was accounted strange. William Otterbein, Martin Beohm, and all others with them, were given to understand that a persisting in such a course of teaching and preaching would and must produce a separation: they would and must be cast out.

Otterbein dearly loved the church in which he had been brought up and ordained a minister, and remained in it as long as a prospect remained of benefiting it; but the hope eventually vanished. He had nothing to retract or to recall of what he had done, and what he was still doing as a faithful servant of his Lord; but the synod of which he had been a member thought otherwise, and the connexion between them was many years previous to his removal from earth fully dissolved. The synod and church parted with him apparently with little

sorrow or regret. But not so with Otterbein; the dissolving of ties and relations so sacred and dear, and next to God and a good conscience, had possessed his affections and his heart, filled his soul with anguish and a weight of sorrow, that at times seemed to know no bounds; tears would fill his eyes, and in big drops run down his cheeks, and then again as if he would lay hold of heaven, he would exclaim, "O how can I give thee up!" In these hours of distress his best friends dared not attempt to comfort him. His closet exercises on the same could be known only to God alone. No conception can now be formed of what he suffered in mind for some years after this sad event. But as his was the night of sorrow, his also, was the joy of the morning. The Lord knows how to send comfort to his chosen ones. In one of those seasons of bereavement and wo, the Bible opened for the morning lesson on the 49th chapter of the Prophet Isaiah, beginning "Listen, O isles, unto me, and hearken ye people, from far; the Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name. And he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand hath he hid me, and made me a polished shaft; in his quiver hath he hid me; and said unto me, Thou art my servant," &c. The word and work run, thousands were blessed, and God was glorified. But the writer is admonished under existing circumstances to observe brevity, and must make one long stride.

The time came when he was no longer able to travel, and leave Baltimore, and take up his accustomed route to attend big meetings; but from the infirmities of his body his mind seemed to gather strength, in pleading with God the more for the prosperity of Zion. The deepest *thought* that for the last year of his life occupied his mind, was, "Shall the work stand and endure the fiery test? And will it ultimately prosper in righteousness after my departure?" A short time previous to his end, he sent for Brothers Newcomer and Bowlus, that he might see them once more, and in conversation with them as to the past and present state of religion and the church, he remarked, "The Lord has been pleased graciously to satisfy me fully that the work will abide."

His benevolence knew no bounds. All he received, and all he had, he gave away in charities. The writer cannot conclude this short and imperfect narration better than with the tribute paid Otterbein by the late Bishop Asbury; who said of him "He was a good man full of faith and the Holy Ghost."

The demise of Otterbein, Beohm, and Geeting, as to time, is: Martin Beohm was permitted to preach to within a short time of his death.

His last illness was short; he, feeling his end was nigh, raised himself up in bed, sang a verse, committing his spirit unto God in solemn prayer, praising God with a loud voice, expired, March 23d, 1812, in the eighty-seventh year of his age, having preached fifty years. George A. Geeting quickly followed Boehm, which was on the 28th of June, same year, 1812. His illness was of but one night and a day, without much pain. Being sensible that his hour had come, he desired to be helped out of bed, which being done, he lined a verse and sang it with a clear voice, knelt down by the bedside, and offered up his last prayer on earth; and in the full triumph of faith bid the world adieu, having preached forty years. Wm. Otterbein, as he was first, was also last of the three; for the year 1813 closed the labours in the vineyard of the Lord of this holy man of God, full of years, of hope, and a glorious immortality. *Soli Deo gloria.*

UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONALISTS.

BY THE REV. ALVAN LAMSON,
DEDHAM, MASS.

ANALYSIS OF THE ENSUING ARTICLE.

1. *Doctrines of Unitarians.*—Great distinguishing features of Unitarianism—Diversity of opinion among Unitarians—Views generally received among them—Character of God—Gospel of Jesus originated in his mercy—Unitarian views of his justice—Jesus Christ—Unitarians believe him to be a distinct being from the Father, and inferior to him—The sort of evidence on which they rely for proving this—Assert the incredibility of the Trinity—Their view of the teachings of the scripture relating to the Son—The inference they make from the conduct of the disciples and others—Their views of Trinitarian proof texts—Of the concessions of Trinitarian Christians—Unitarians do not address Christ directly in prayer—Reasons for not doing it—Question of his nature—How regarded by Unitarians—His character and offices—True ground of reverence for Jesus, according to Unitarians—Unitarian views of the divinity of Christ—Their views of the Atonement—They do not, they contend, destroy the hope of the sinner, nor rob the Cross of its power—Unitarian views of the Holy Spirit—Of the terms of salvation—Of the new birth—How Unitarians speak of reverence for human nature—Need of help—Retribution for sin and holiness—Of the Bible—Their reply to the charge of unduly exalting human reason.

2. *History.*—Unitarians do not profess to hold any new doctrine—What they affirm, that they are able to prove of the Unitarianism of the ancient Church—Reference to modern Unitarianism in Europe—American Unitarianism—Its date—Its progress, to the commencement of the present century—Its state during the first fifteen years of this century—1815 an epoch in its history—First controversy—Its origin and results—Second controversy—First separation between orthodox and Unitarian Congregationalists.

3. *Statistics.*—Number of societies and churches—Other Unitarians besides Congregationalists—Unitarian periodicals—American Unitarian Association—Present condition and prospects of Unitarianism.

THE brevity we must study in this article will not allow us to give any thing more than a very meagre sketch of the views held by Unitarian Congregationalists of the United States, and add a few facts concerning the history and reception of these views, and the general statistics of the denomination.

DOCTRINES.

Unitarianism takes its name from its distinguishing tenet, the strict personal unity of God, which Unitarians hold in opposition to the doctrine which teaches that God exists in three persons. Unitarians maintain that God is one mind, one person, one undivided being; that the Father alone is entitled to be called God in the highest sense; that he alone possesses the attributes of infinite, underived divinity, and is the only proper object of supreme worship and love. They believe that Jesus Christ is a distinct being from him, and possesses only derived attributes; that he is not the supreme God himself, but his Son, and the mediator through whom he has chosen to impart the richest blessings of his love to a sinning world.

This must be called the great leading doctrine, the distinguishing, and, properly speaking, the only distinguishing feature of Unitarianism. Unitarians hold the supremacy of the Father, and the inferior and derived nature of the Son. This is their sole discriminating article of faith.

On several other points they differ among themselves. Professing little reverence for human creeds, having no common standard but the Bible, and allowing, in the fullest extent, freedom of thought and the liberty of every Christian to interpret the records of divine revelation for himself, they look for diversity of opinion as the necessary result. They see not, they say, how this is to be avoided without a violation of the grand Protestant principle of individual faith and liberty. They claim to be thorough and consistent Protestants.

There are certain general views, however, in which they are mostly agreed, as flowing from the great discriminating article of faith above mentioned, or intimately connected with it, or which they feel compelled to adopt on a diligent examination of the sacred volume. Of the more important of these views, as they are commonly received by Unitarian Congregationalists of the United States, some account may be here expected. To do full justice to the subject, however, would require far more space than it would be proper for this article to occupy.

We begin with the character of God. Unitarians, as we said, hold to his strict personal unity; they are accustomed, too, to dwell with peculiar emphasis on his moral perfections, and especially his paternal love and mercy. They believe that he yearns, with a father's tenderness and pity, towards the whole offspring of Adam. They believe that he earnestly desires their repentance and holiness; that his infinite, overflowing love, led him, miraculously, to raise up and send

Jesus to be their spiritual deliverer, to purify their souls from sin, to restore them to communion with himself, and fit them for pardon and everlasting life in his presence; in a word, to reconcile man to God, and earth to heaven.

They believe that the gospel of Jesus originated in the exhaustless and unbought love of the Father; that it is intended to operate on man, and not on God; that the only obstacle which exists, or which ever has existed on the part of God, to the forgiveness of the sinner, is found in the heart of the sinner himself; that the life, teachings, and resurrection of Jesus, become an instrument of pardon, as they are the appointed means of turning man from sin to holiness, of breathing into his soul new moral and spiritual life, and elevating it to a union with the Father. They believe that the cross of Christ was not needed to render God merciful; that Jesus suffered, not as a victim of God's wrath, or to satisfy his justice; they think that this view obscures the glory of the divine character, is repugnant to God's equity, veils his loveliest attributes, and is injurious to a spirit of filial trusting piety. Thus all in their view, is to be referred primarily to the boundless and unpurchased love of the Father, whose wisdom chose this method of bringing man within reach of his pardoning mercy, by redeeming him from the power of sin, and establishing in his heart his kingdom of righteousness and peace.

We now proceed to speak of Jesus Christ. As before said, Unitarians believe him to be a distinct being from God and subordinate to him. The following may serve as a specimen of the process of thought, views, and impressions through which they arrive at this conclusion. We beg leave to state them, not for the purpose of argument, for we have no wish here to enter into any defence of Unitarian sentiments, but simply that our views may be understood, and the more especially, as we have reason to believe that they are often misapprehended. No more of argument will be introduced, and no more of the history of ancient and foreign Unitarianism, than appears necessary to put the reader in complete possession of the sentiments and position of the sect as it exists in this country.

Unitarians do not rely exclusively, or chiefly, on what they conceive to be the intrinsic incredibility of the doctrine to which they stand opposed. They take the Bible in their hands, as they say, and sitting down to read it, as plain unlettered Christians, and with prayer for divine illumination, they find that the general tenor of its language either distinctly asserts or necessarily implies the supremacy of the Father, and teaches the inferior and derived nature of the Son. In proof of this, they appeal to such passages as the following: "This is

life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." (John xvii. 3.) "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. ii. 5.) "My Father is greater than I." (John xiv. 28.) "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." (Ibid. vii. 16.) "I speak not of myself." (Ibid. xiv. 10.) "I can of my own self do nothing." (Ibid. v. 30.) "The Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works." (Ibid. xiv. 10.) "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ." (Acts ii. 36.) "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour." (Ibid. v. 31.)

They appeal to such passages, and generally to all those in which Jesus Christ is called, not God himself, but the Son of God; in which he is spoken of as sent, and the Father as sending, appointing him a kingdom, "giving" him authority, giving him to be head over all things to the Church. Such passages, they contend, show derived power and authority. Again, when the Son is represented as praying to the Father, and the Father as hearing and granting his prayer, how, ask they, can the plain serious reader, resist the conviction, that he who prays is a different being from him to whom he prays? Does a being pray to himself?

Unitarians urge, that passages like those above referred to, occurring promiscuously, are fair specimens of the language in which Jesus is spoken of in the New Testament; that such is the common language of the Bible, and that it is wholly irreconcilable with the idea that Jesus was regarded by those with whom he lived and conversed, as the infinite and supreme God, or that the Bible was meant to teach any such doctrine. They do not find, they say, that the deportment of the disciples and the multitudes towards Jesus, the questions they asked him, and the character of their intercourse with him, indicated any such belief on their part, or any supposition that he was the infinite Jehovah. We meet, say they, with no marks of that surprise and astonishment which they must have expressed on being first made acquainted with the doctrine,—on being told that he who stood before them, who ate and drank with them, who slept and waked, who was capable of fatigue and sensible to pain, was in truth, the Infinite and Immutable One, the Preserver and Governor of nature.

They contend that the passages generally adduced to prove the supreme deity of Jesus Christ, fail of their object; that without violence they will receive a different construction; that such construction is often absolutely required by the language itself, or the connexion in which it stands; that most of those passages, if carefully examined, far from disproving, clearly show the distinct nature and

inferiority of the Son. They notice the fact as a remarkable one, that of all the proof texts, as they are called, of the Trinity, there is not one on which, at one time or another, eminent Trinitarian critics have not put a Unitarian construction, and thus they agree that Unitarianism may be proved from the concessions of Trinitarians themselves.

To the doctrine of three persons in one God, Unitarians object again, its intrinsic incredibility. They say, that they cannot receive the doctrine, because in asserting that there are three persons in the Divinity, it teaches, according to any conception they can form of the subject, that there are three beings, three minds, three conscious agents, and thus it makes three Gods, and to assert that these three are one, is a contradiction.

So too with regard to the Saviour,—to affirm that the same being is both finite and infinite, man and God, they say appears to them to be a contradiction and an absurdity. If Jesus Christ possessed two natures, two wills, two minds, a finite and an infinite, they maintain that he must be two persons, two beings.

Unitarians of the present day, as far as we know, do not think it lawful directly to address Christ in prayer.

They think that his own example, the direction he gave to his disciples—"When ye pray, say, Our Father,"—and such expressions as the following, "In that day," that is, when I am withdrawn from you into heaven, "ye shall ask me nothing; verily, verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name he will give it you," not only authorize, but absolutely require prayer to be addressed directly to the Father. To prove that the ancient Christians were accustomed thus to address their prayers, they allege the authority of Origen, who lived in the former part of the third century, and was eminent for piety and talents, and in learning surpassed all the Christians of his day. "If we understand what prayer is," says Origen, "it will appear that it is never to be offered to any originated being, not to Christ himself, but only to the God and Father of all; to whom our Saviour himself prayed and taught us to pray."

In regard to the metaphysical nature and rank of the Son, and the time at which his existence commenced, Unitarians undoubtedly differ in opinion. Some hold his pre-existence, and others suppose that his existence commenced at the time of his entrance into the world.

The question of his nature they do not consider as important. Some take this view. They think that the testimony of the apostles, the original witnesses to whom we are indebted for our knowledge of

him, bears only on his birth, miracles, teachings, life, death, resurrection and ascension, that is, on his character and offices, and that beyond these we need not go; that these are all which it is important that we should know or believe; that the rest is speculation, hypothesis, with which, as practical Christians, we have no concern; that our comfort, our hope, our security of pardon and eternal life depend not upon our knowledge or belief in it.

At the same time all entertain exalted views of his character and offices. In a reverence for these they profess to yield to no class of Christians. The divinity which others ascribe to his person, they think may with more propriety be referred to these. "We believe firmly," says one of the most eminent writers in the sect, "in the divinity of Christ's mission and office, that he spoke with divine authority, and was a bright image of the divine perfections.

"We believe that God dwelt in him, manifested himself through him, taught men by him, and communicated to him his Spirit without measure.

"We believe that Jesus Christ was the most glorious display, expression, and representative of God to mankind, so that through seeing and knowing him, we see and know the invisible Father; so that when Christ came, God visited the world and dwelt with men more conspicuously than at any former period. In Christ's words we hear God speaking; in his miracles we behold God acting; in his character and life, we see an unsullied image of God's purity and love. We believe, then, in the divinity of Christ, as this term is often and properly used."

Unitarians do not think that they detract from the true glory of the Son. They regard him as one with God in affection, will, and purpose. This union, they think, is explained by the words of the Saviour himself: "Be ye also one," says he to his disciples, "even as I and my Father are one;" one not in nature, but in purpose, affection and act. Through him Christians are brought near to the Father, and their hearts are penetrated with divine love. By union with him as the true vine, they are nurtured in the spiritual life. In his teachings they find revelations of holy truth. They ascribe peculiar power and significance to his cross. To that emblem of self-sacrificing love, they teem with emotions which language is too poor to express.

The cross is connected in the minds of Christians with the atonement. On this subject Unitarians feel constrained to differ from many of their fellow Christians. Unitarians do not reject the atonement in what they believe to be the scriptural meaning of the term. While they gratefully acknowledge the mediation of Christ, and believe that

through the channel of his gospel are conveyed to them the most precious blessings of a Father's mercy, they object strongly to the views frequently expressed, of the connexion of the death of Christ with the forgiveness of sin. They do not believe that the sufferings of Christ were penal—designed to satisfy a principle of stern justice; for justice, say they, does not inflict suffering on the innocent in order to pardon the guilty; and besides, they believe that God's justice is in perfect harmony with his mercy; that to separate them, even in thought, is greatly to dishonour him. They believe that however the cross stands connected with the forgiveness of sin, that connexion, as before said, is to be explained by the effects wrought on man and not on God.

They believe that in thus teaching they do not rob the cross of its power, nor take away from the sinner ground of hope. To the objection that sin requires an infinite atonement, and that none but an infinite being can make that atonement, they reply by saying, that they find in their Bibles not one word of this infinite atonement, and besides, that no act of a finite being, a frail, sinning child of dust, can possess a character of infinity, or merit an infinite punishment; that it is an abuse of language so to speak; and further, that if an infinite sufferer were necessary to make due atonement for sin, no such atonement could ever be made, for infinite cannot suffer; that God is unchangeable, and it is both absurd and impious to ascribe suffering to him; God cannot die; and admitting Jesus to have been God as well as man, only his human nature suffered; that there was no infinite sufferer in the case; that thus the theory of the infinite atonement proves a fallacy, and the whole fabric falls to the ground. Still is not the sinner left without hope, because he leans on the original and unchanging love and compassion of the Father, to whom as the prime fountain we trace back all gospel means and influences, and who is ever ready to pardon those, who through Christ and his cross are brought to repentance for sin and holiness of heart and life.

Further, the Unitarians reply, that whatever mysterious offices the cross of Christ may be supposed to possess, beyond its natural power to affect the heart, it must owe that efficacy wholly to the divine appointment, and thus the nature and rank of the instrument become of no importance, since the omnipotence of God can endow the weakest instrument with power to produce any effect he designs to accomplish by it.

They quote Bishop Watson, a Trinitarian writer, as saying that "all depends on the appointment of God;" that it will not do for us to question the propriety of any "means his goodness has appointed, merely because we cannot see how it is fitted to attain the end;" that

neither the Arian nor the Humanitarian hypothesis necessarily precludes "atonement by the death of Jesus." (Charge delivered in 1795.)

By the Holy Spirit, Unitarians suppose is meant not a person, but an influence; and hence it is spoken of as "poured out," "given," and we read of the "anointing" with the Holy Spirit, phrases, which they contend, preclude the idea of a person. It was given miraculously to the first disciples, and gently as the gathering dews of evening distils upon the heart of the followers of Jesus in all ages, helping their infirmity, ministering to their renewal, and ever strengthening and comforting them. It is given in answer to prayer, as Christ said: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" (Luke xi. 13.)

Unitarians believe that salvation through the gospel is offered to all, on such terms as all, by God's help, which he will never withhold from any who earnestly strive to know and do his will, and lead a pure, humble, and benevolent life, have power to accept.

They reject the doctrine of native total depravity; but they assert that man is born weak, and in possession of appetites and propensities, by the abuse of which all become actual sinners; and they believe in the necessity of what is figuratively expressed by the "new birth," that is, the becoming spiritual and holy, being led by that spirit of truth and love which Jesus came to introduce into the souls of his followers. This change is significantly called the coming of the kingdom in the heart, without which, as they teach, the pardon of sin, were it possible, would confer no happiness, and the songs of Paradise would fall with harsh dissonance on the ear.

Unitarians sometimes speak of reverence for human nature—of reverence for the soul. They reverence it as God's work, formed for undying growth and improvement. They believe that it possesses powers capable of receiving the highest truths. They believe that God, in various ways, makes revelations of truth and duty to the human soul; that in various ways he quickens it; kindles in it holy thoughts and aspirations, and inspires it by his life-giving presence. They believe that however darkened and degraded, it is capable of being regenerated, renewed, by the means and influences which he provides. They believe that it is not so darkened by the fall but that some good, some power, some capacity of spiritual life, is left in it. But they acknowledge that it has need of help; that it has need to be breathed upon by the divine Spirit. They believe that there is nothing in their peculiar mode of viewing Christianity which encourages proscription; encourages pride and self-exaltation. They believe

that the heart which knows itself will be ever humble. They believe that they must perpetually look to God for help. They teach the necessity of prayer, and a diligent use of the means of devout culture; they do not thus teach reverence for human nature in any such sense, they think, as would countenance the idea that man is sufficient to save himself without God: they pray to him for illumination, pray that he will more and more communicate of himself to their souls. They teach the blighting consequences of sin. They believe that in the universe which God has formed, this is the only essential and lasting evil; and that to rescue the human soul from its power, to win it back to the love of God, of truth and right, and to obedience, to a principle of enlarged benevolence which embraces every fellow-being as a brother, is the noblest work which religion can achieve, and worth all the blood and tears which were poured out by Jesus in his days of humiliation.

While they earnestly inculcate the necessity of a holy heart and a pure and benevolent life, they deny that man is to be saved by his own merit, or works, except as a condition to which the mercy of God has been pleased to annex the gift of everlasting life and felicity. Unitarian Congregationalists believe firmly in a future retribution for sin and holiness.

There is nothing peculiar in the sentiments which, as a body, they entertain of the Bible. They regard the sacred books of it as containing words of a divine revelation miraculously made to the world. They receive it as their standard, their rule of faith and life, interpreting it as they think consistency and the principles of sound and approved criticism demand. They make use of the common, or King James' version, as it is called, but like all well-informed Christians, they think that a reverence for truth and a desire to ascertain the will of God, justify and require them, wherever there is any doubt about the meaning, to appeal to the original, or to compare other versions. In doing this, they say, that they do not fear that they shall be condemned by any intelligent Christian.

In proof of their reverence for the Bible, they appeal to the circumstance that several of the ablest defenders of Christianity against the attacks of infidels, have been Unitarians, a fact, say they, which they are confident no one acquainted with the theological literature of modern ages will call in question.

To the charge that they unduly exalt human reason, Unitarian Christians reply by saying, that the Bible is addressed to us as reasonable beings, that reverence for its records, and respect for the natures which God has bestowed on us, and which Christ came to save,

make it our duty to use our understanding and the best lights which are afforded us, for ascertaining its meaning; that God cannot contradict in one way what he records in another; that his word and works must utter a consistent language; that if the Bible be his gift, it cannot be at war with nature and human reason; that if we discard reason in its interpretation, there is no absurdity we may not deduce from it; that we cannot do it greater dishonour than to admit that it will not stand the scrutiny of reason; that if our faculties are not worthy of trust, if they are so distempered by the fall, that we can no longer repose any confidence in their veracity: then revelation itself cannot benefit us, for we have no reason left of judging of its evidences or import, and are reduced at once to a state of utter scepticism.

Such, omitting minor differences, are the leading views of the Unitarian Congregationalists of the United States. They do not claim to hold all these views as peculiar to themselves. Several of them they share in common with other classes of Christians, or with individuals of other denominations.

HISTORY.

Of the history and statistics of Unitarians in the United States, we have left ourselves little room to speak. The Unitarians of these days do not profess to hold any new doctrines. They speak of its antiquity and revival.

The history of ancient Unitarianism, I must pass over, both as foreign to the object of this sketch, and a subject which would require more space than is assigned for our whole article. I will only state in a single paragraph what modern Unitarians contend that they are able to prove in regard to the early prevalence of the doctrine. They begin by stating that the Jews before the time of the Saviour, were strictly Unitarian; that it is a fact as well ascertained as any fact can be, that the Jewish Christians of the early ages were so also; being believers in the simple humanity of Jesus; that several of the early fathers recognise this fact; and that this belief was not originally deemed heretical. They contend and profess to show, that all the fathers for more than three hundred years after the commencement of the Christian era, never fail of ascribing supremacy to the Father, and held the strict and proper inferiority of the Son; that they made him a distinct being from the Father, though many of them assigned him from all eternity a sort of metaphysical, or potential, existence in the Father as an attribute, that is, his wisdom or

reason, which attribute took a separate personal existence a little before the creation of the world, and became an agent of the Father in its formation. In this they differ from the Arians, who taught that he was created out of nothing. Unitarians affirm, that the germ of the doctrine of the Trinity is first traced in the learned Platonizing converts, who brought it with them from the school of human philosophy; they say that its origin is thus in their view satisfactorily explained; they contend that it was of gradual formation, and that they can trace its growth from age to age, till it acquired something like its present form about the middle of the fifth century. These views they think have been well established in modern writings, both in this country and in England.

We now come to modern Unitarianism. The history of this, too, in foreign countries, we must dismiss in some half a dozen or a dozen sentences, stating merely a few general facts.

We discover traces of anti-trinitarian sentiments, in the early days of the Reformation under Luther, and Unitarianism was openly avowed and defended by Cellarius, a learned man, a native of Stuttgart, born in 1499, and for some time united in warm friendship with Luther and Melancthon. Several of the learned contemporaries of Luther, in Germany and Switzerland, embraced the same sentiments. Servetus, a native of Aragon, was burned as a heretic for his Unitarianism, at Geneva, in 1553. About the same time a society of Unitarians in Italy was broken up and dispersed by the Inquisition. A retreat was afterwards opened to them in Poland; they had a college at Racow, numbering at one time more than a thousand students; they had churches in all parts of the kingdom, and their sentiments were embraced by many of the chief nobility. There they flourished many years, and left behind them many monuments of their learning and zeal. They were banished from the kingdom in 1660. Some went to England; some to different parts of Germany; and some to Transylvania, where they still exist as a distinct sect. Holland still contains a considerable number, and most of the pastors of Germany hold Unitarian sentiments.

In England, they are traced back to the early part of the sixteenth century; but there as elsewhere, they were subject to severe persecution for their opinions, and some of them sealed their faith with their blood. The doctrine, however, was not suppressed, and English Unitarianism numbers a long line of learned men, the ornaments of their age and of humanity. Among them we find the names of Emlyn, Whiston, Dr. Samuel Clark, Lardner, Price, Priestley, Lindsey, Aikin, Jebb, Rees, and many others, besides the three greater

lights, Locke, Newton, and the poet Milton. Unitarian sentiments are now extensively diffused among the Presbyterians of England, and in the north of Ireland; and Unitarian houses of worship exist in different places in Scotland. The last report of the American Unitarian Association (May 1842) states the number of Unitarian congregations in England at about 300; in Ireland, at 39; in Scotland, at 12. Of those who have renounced the Church of Rome in Holland, Switzerland, France and Germany, the same document affirms, that not less than one half hold the Unitarian faith.

American Unitarianism dates back, at least, to the middle of the last century. In a letter to Dr. Moore, dated May 15th, 1815, the older President Adams says, in reply to a statement that Unitarianism was then only thirty years old in New England, "I can testify as a witness to its old age." He goes back sixty-five years, and names some clergymen, and among others Dr. Mayhew of Boston, and Gay of Hingham, who were Unitarians. "Among the laity," he adds, "how many could I name, lawyers, physicians, tradesmen, farmers!" There was, however, little open avowal of Unitarianism at this period, nor until after the American Revolution; nor were there many congregations professedly Unitarian until after the commencement of the present century, though as early as 1756, Emlyn's Inquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ, was republished in Boston, and extensively read.

In 1785, the society worshipping at King's Chapel, Boston, adopted an amended liturgy, from which Trinitarian sentiments were excluded. Between that period and the end of the century, Unitarian sentiments manifested themselves to a small extent in Maine, and Mr. Bently openly preached them in Salem, Massachusetts. The same sentiments were preached in the southern parts of the state, in Plymouth and Barnstable counties, in the latter of which there were many Unitarians. In the western part of Massachusetts, in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire, Unitarianism had made but little progress. Out of New England, few if any traces of it were visible, except at Northumberland and Philadelphia, where Dr. Priestley had made some converts.

Thus closed the eighteenth century. But though, as before remarked, there was at this time but little open profession of Unitarianism, the general tone of thinking and feeling in Boston and the vicinity, was decidedly Unitarian, or, at least, the current was strongly setting that way.

During the first fifteen years of the present century, controversy on the subject was seldom or never introduced into the pulpit, but Uni-

tarianism was making silent progress. Many having ceased to hear the opposite sentiments inculcated, embraced it, often without any distinct consciousness of the fact. The term Unitarianism was then seldom heard in New England, those since called Unitarians being then denominated Liberal Christians. The appointment of one of them to the divinity professorship at Cambridge, in 1805, was the occasion of some controversy.

The year 1815 formed an epoch in the history of American Unitarianism. The circumstances were briefly these: Mr. Belsham, in his *Memoirs of Lindsey*, published in London in 1812, had introduced a chapter on American Unitarianism, or as it was expressed, on the "Progress and Present State of the Unitarian Churches in America." This was republished in Boston in 1815, with a Preface by the American editor, the object of the republication being to sound the alarm against Unitarianism on this side the Atlantic. The pamphlet was immediately reviewed in the *Panoplist*, an Orthodox publication of the day. The two publications caused great excitement. The *Panoplist* especially, was complained of by Unitarians, as greatly misrepresenting their sentiments, and containing many injurious aspersions on their character.

A controversy ensued, Dr. Channing leading the way, in a letter addressed to the Rev. S. C. Thacher, in which he charges the *Panoplist* with the attempt to fasten on the Unitarians of this country all the odium of Mr. Belsham's peculiar views, and replies to what he conceived to be other misrepresentations of the reviewer, particularly to the accusation of hypocritical concealment, brought against the Unitarians. Several pamphlets were written in this controversy by Dr. Channing, Dr. Samuel Worcester, of Salem, and some others, mostly in 1815.

The tendency of this controversy was to draw a sharp and distinct line between the parties. The *Panoplist* had urged on the Orthodox the necessity of a separation "in worship and communion from Unitarians." From that time the exchange of pulpits between the clergymen of orthodox and liberal denominations, in a great measure, ceased, though all were not prepared for this decided step. Many congregations were much divided in opinion; a separation was viewed by many as a great evil; many were strongly opposed to it, but it now became inevitable.

The Unitarian controversy, strictly so called, brought up the question of the rights of churches and parishes, respectively, in the settlement of a minister. Before the excitement on this subject had

subsided, another controversy arose, occasioned by Dr. Channing's sermon, preached at Baltimore, at the ordination of Mr. Sparks.

This controversy embraced the doctrine of the Trinity, and the doctrines of Calvinism generally, all of which were subjected to a very thorough discussion. Professor Stuart, of Andover, appeared in defence of the Trinity, and Mr. Andrews Norton in opposition to it, in an article in the *Christian Examiner*, subsequently enlarged and published in a separate volume, under the title, "A Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrine of Trinitarians, concerning the Nature of God, and the Person of Christ." Dr. Woods, of Andover, defended the doctrines of Calvinism, and Dr. Ware, of Harvard University, replied. There were several replications and rejoinders on both sides. A discussion was at the same time going on between Mr. Sparks, of Baltimore, and Dr. Miller, of Princeton.

By the time this controversy subsided, the Orthodox and Unitarian Congregationalists were found to constitute two distinct bodies. The ministers of both divisions, however, in Massachusetts, still annually met in convention as Congregationalists, a name which belongs equally to both, but have, elsewhere, little religious fellowship or communion.

Such is the origin and history, so far as they can be given here, of the American Unitarians, viewed as constituting a distinct class or denomination of Christians. They are mostly the descendants of the old Congregationalists of New England, and are still Congregationalists, the forms of which they value for what they regard as their scriptural simplicity, as well as from many ancestral associations.

STATISTICS.

It is difficult to estimate the number of Unitarians in the United States; and of their character for intelligence, piety, and benevolence, it does not become us, in the present article, to speak. When they have no separate place of worship, they continue in many instances united in worship with orthodox societies. From the Fifteenth Report of the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association (May, 1840), it appears that the number of religious societies and churches professedly Unitarian, in Massachusetts, was then 150; in Maine, 15; in New Hampshire, 19; and out of New England, 36. The number has since increased, and is now estimated in all about 300. These are Congregational Unitarians, to whom this article refers. The same document assigns to the denomination called Chris-

tians, (who are also Unitarians), in 1833, 700 ministers, 1000 churches; from 75,000 to 100,000 communicants, and from 250,000 to 300,000 worshippers. Besides the Congregational Unitarians, it is computed that there are now in the United States, about 2,000 congregations of Unitarians, chiefly of the sect called Christians, Universalists, and Friends or Quakers.

Among the periodicals which utter Unitarian sentiments, at the present time, are the *Christian Register*, a weekly paper, commenced in Boston, in 1822; the *Monthly Miscellany of Religion and Letters*, a monthly publication in Boston, commenced in 1829; and the *Christian Examiner*. The latter was originally issued under the name of the *Christian Disciple*, a monthly publication, commenced at Boston in 1813, under the superintendence of the late Dr. Noah Worcester. It continued under his charge until 1819, when a new series was commenced under different editors. This series terminated with the fifth volume, at the end of 1823. The work then took the name of the *Christian Examiner*, which is still continued, a number being issued every two months, the 34th volume being now in the course of publication. This work, which combines literature with theology, has always sustained a high reputation for learning and ability,—nearly all the more eminent Unitarians of the day having been, at different times, numbered among its contributors.

The American Unitarian Association was founded in Boston, in 1825. An extensive correspondence is carried on, and other business transacted by the general secretary of the Association; and there are now several auxiliaries in different parts of the United States.

The Association holds its annual meetings at Boston, in May of each year, at which the report of the secretary is read, after which various topics are discussed in speeches or addresses. The Association, through its Executive Committee, issues tracts monthly, of which the 16th volume is now in the course of publication.

It furnishes temporary aid to small and destitute societies, and does something for domestic missions, particularly in the Western States. There is also a Book and Pamphlet Society, not under the control of the Association, but which co-operates, in some measure, with it, and distributes a large number of books and tracts.

The last annual report of the Association speaks of the condition and prospects of the denomination, as in a high degree encouraging. Societies, it affirms, are multiplying in New England, and in various parts of the South and West. If the spirit of active controversy in the sect is passing away, as some think, the importance of a living,

practical faith, and an earnest piety, was never more deeply felt. The present year, active efforts have been made, and not wholly in vain, to raise funds to meet the wants of the denomination, especially to educate young men for the ministry, to assist destitute societies, and support missionaries; in different ways to promote the cause of spiritual Christianity, and aid in building up the kingdom of the Redeemer in the world.

UNIVERSALISTS.

BY THE REV. A. B. GROSH.
UTICA, N. Y.

SUCH is the general and approved name of that denomination of Christians, which is distinguished for believing that God will finally save all mankind from sin and death, and make all intelligences holy and happy by and through the mediation of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world. Anciently, believers in this sentiment were called by its opposers, "Merciful Doctors;" and at a later day, "Hell-redemptionists" and "Restorationers;" and within a few years past, efforts have been made to create a distinction among them, by classing them as "Restorationists" and "Ultra-Universalists;"—but the denomination itself, though composed of all classes thus attempted to be distinguished and divided off, claims for itself the sole name of UNIVERSALIST, and disclaims any other *distinctive title* by which to be designated. The great general sentiment of *the final, universal salvation of all moral beings from sin and death*, in which this denomination is united, and by which it is distinguished, is termed *Universalism*; or, sometimes, by way of varying the phraseology, "the Abrahamic faith;" because it is the gospel that was declared to Abraham—or, sometimes, "the Restitution," or, "the Restitution of all things," &c. But that the reader may have as full information of this denomination and its faith, as the limits of this work will permit, I will state—*First*, the history of the sentiment peculiar to it. *Second*, the rise, progress, present condition, and prospects of the denomination in its collective capacity. *Third*, a brief summary of the general views held by Universalists, and the principal scriptures on which they rely for support.

I. THE HISTORY OF THE SENTIMENT, OR DOCTRINE, OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION FROM SIN.

The first intimation of God's purpose to destroy the cause of moral evil, and restore man to purity and happiness, is contained in the pro-

mise, that the serpent, (which represents the origin and cause of sin,) after bruising man's heel, (a curable injury of the most inferior portion of humanity,) should have its head bruised by the woman's Seed. (Genesis iii. 15.) A bruise of the head is death to the serpent, (and to what that reptile represents;) and the destruction being effected by the Seed of the woman, shows man's final and complete deliverance from, and triumph over, all evil. In accordance with the idea conveyed by representing man's heel only, as being bruised, is the limitation of the punishment divinely pronounced on the first pair of transgressors, to the duration of their earthly lives—(Genesis iii. 17, 19)—and the total absence of every thing like even a hint, that God would punish Cain, or Lamech, or the antediluvians, with an infinite or endless penalty—and the institution of *temporal punishment only*, in the law given by Moses. And the intimation of the final, total destruction of the very cause of moral evil, and of all its works or effects, (or all sin,) is further explained and confirmed by later and more conclusive testimony, in which it is stated that Jesus would destroy death and the devil, the devil and all his works; and that the grave (*Hades*, or Hell) and its victory, and death and its sting, (which is *sin*,) would exist no more after the resurrection of the dead. (See Heb. ii. 14; 1 John iii. 8; and 1 Cor. xv. 54-57.)

This brief intimation of the ultimate destruction of evil, and man's salvation therefrom, grew into that divine promise to Abraham and his descendants, which the apostle Paul expressly calls "the gospel," viz., that in Abraham and his seed, (which seed is Jesus Christ,) "shall all the families," "all the nations," and "all kindreds of the earth be blessed"—by being "turned away every one from iniquity," and by being "justified (i. e. made just) by faith." (Compare Genesis xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18, and xxvi. 4, with Acts iii. 25, 26, and Galatians iii. 8.) Christ being a *spiritual* Prince, and a *spiritual* Saviour only, and this gospel being a *spiritual* promise; of course the blessings promised to all, *in* Christ, will be spiritual also, and not merely temporal. For all that are blessed *in* Christ, are to be new creatures. (2 Cor. v. 17.) Accordingly we find this solemn, oath-confirmed promise of God—this "gospel preached before due time to Abraham"—made the basis and subject of almost every prophecy relating to the ultimate prevalence, and universal, endless triumph of God's moral dominion under the mediatorial reign of Jesus Christ.

But if we would obtain a more perfect understanding of those prophetic promises, we must examine them in connexion with the expositions given of their meaning, by the Saviour and his apostles, in the New Testament. One or two examples are all that can be given

here. The subjugation of all things to the dominion of man, (Ps. viii. 5, 6,) is expressly applied to the spiritual subjugation of all souls to Jesus, by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who declares it a *universal* subjection; ("for in that he put *all* in subjection under him, he *left nothing* that is *not* put under him;") and that it is not the present physical or external subjection, but the prospectively final, spiritual and internal subjection that is meant—"for we see *not yet* all things put under him," &c. (Heb. ii. 8, 9.) And in 1 Cor. xv. 24-28, this subjection is represented as taking place after all opposing powers are put down, and the *last* enemy is destroyed—and it is connected with the subjection of *all alike* unto Jesus, and of Jesus unto God, and is declared to be, that God may be all that is in all;—thus most emphatically and conclusively showing that nothing but a thorough, spiritual subjection of the whole soul to God can be intended. And that it is to be strictly universal, is evident, also, from the 27th verse, where God is expressly named as the only being in the universe who will not be subjected to the moral dominion of Jesus—thus agreeing with the testimony of Hebrews ii. 8, before quoted. Again: the promise of universal blessedness in the gospel, under the figure of a feast for all people, made on Mount Zion, and the swallowing up of death in victory, recorded in Isaiah xxv. 6-8, is very positively applied by the Apostle Paul to the resurrection of all men to immortality—thus showing its universality, its spirituality, and its endlessness. (See 1 Cor. xv. 54.) And again: in Isaiah lv. 10, 11, God gives a pledge that his word will more certainly accomplish all it is sent to perform, than will his natural agents perform their mission. In Isa. xlv. 22-24, he informs us that the mission of his word is, to make every knee bow, and every tongue swear allegiance, and surely say* that in the Lord each one has righteousness and strength. The apostle to the Gentiles, in speaking of the flesh-embodied Word of God, Jesus of Nazareth, in a very emphatic manner confirmed the absolute universality of this promise, by declaring that it included all in heaven, and in earth, and under the earth, in its promise of final salvation, by gathering them into Christ. (See Phil. ii. 9-11.) This acknowledgment of Jesus, as universal Lord or owner, is to be made by the influence of the Holy Spirit—(1 Cor. xii. 3; and Rom. xiv. 8, 9, compared with John vi. 37-39, and Phil. iii. 21)—and is called *reconciliation*, without which, indeed, it could not be a true spiritual subjection and allegiance. (Col. i. 19, 20; and Eph. i. 8-10.)

* The word "*one*" being in italics, was supplied by the translators, and is no part of the original scripture.

Thus have we very briefly traced the rise and gradual development of the doctrine of universal salvation, from its first intimation down to its full and clear exposition;—thus proving that it is, indeed, “the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouths of all his holy prophets, since the world began”—(Acts iii. 21)—and the gospel which God “hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things.” This gospel of the great salvation, so abundantly testified to by the apostles of the Saviour, was undoubtedly the faith of the primitive churches. True, other matters more directly engaged the preaching and controversies of the early teachers; for both Jews and Gentiles denied that Jesus was a divinely commissioned teacher, and that he rose from the dead after his crucifixion and burial—and many also denied the resurrection of the dead in general. But it is a fact clearly stated on the page of ecclesiastical history, and proved by the writings of the early Fathers themselves, that the doctrine of universal salvation was held, without any directly counter sentiment being taught, until the days of Tertullian, in A. D. 204; and that Tertullian himself was the *first Christian* writer now known, who asserted the doctrine of the absolute eternity of hell-torments, or, that the punishment of the wicked and the happiness of the saints were equal in duration. Nor was there any opposition to the doctrine of universal salvation, until long after the days of Origen, (about A. D. 394,)—nor was it ever declared a heresy by the Church in general, until as late as the year 553, when the fifth General Council thus declared it false. But that the reader may have names and dates, we will here name a few of the most eminent Fathers, with the date of their greatest fame, who openly avowed and publicly taught the doctrine of Universalism.

A. D. 140, the authors of the Sibylline Oracles; 190, Clement, President of the Catechetical School at Alexandria, the most learned and illustrious man before Origen; 185, Origen, the light of the Church in his day, whose reputation for learning and sanctity gave rise to many followers, and finally a great party, in the Christian Church, the most of whom (if not all) were decided believers and advocates of Universalism. Among these we will merely name, (for we have no room for remarks,) Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, and Titus, Bishop of Bostra; A. D. 360, Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen, Archbishop of Constantinople; 380, Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, and Fabius Manus Victorinus; A. D. 390, the Origenists, the Gnostics, and the Manicheans generally held it about this time, and many eminent fathers whom we have not room to particularize. Those we have named quoted the same texts, and used many of the

arguments in proof of the doctrine, that are now urged by Universalists. And it is a remark-worthy fact, that the Greek Fathers who wrote against endless misery, and in favour of Universalism, nevertheless used the Greek word *aion* and its derivatives, (rendered *ever*, *for ever*, *everlasting*, and *eternal*, in our common English version of the Bible,) to express the duration of punishment, which they stated to be limited—thus proving that the ancient meaning of these words was not *endless* duration when applied to sin and suffering. For instances, with reference to author and page, see the “Ancient History of Universalism, by the Rev. H. Ballou 2d” from which the foregoing very condensed statement is extracted.

After existing unmolested, in fact, after being the *prevailing sentiment* of the Christian Church, for nearly 500 years—especially of that portion of the Church nearest Judea, and therefore most under the influence imparted by the personal disciples of the Lord Jesus,—Universalism was at last put down, as its Great Teacher had been before it, by *human force* and authority. From the fifth General Council, in A. D. 553, we may trace the rapid decline of pure Christianity. During all the dark ages of rapine, blood and cruelty, Universalism was unknown in theory as it was in practice; and the doctrine of ceaseless sin and suffering prevailed without a rival. But no sooner was the Reformation commenced, and arts and learning began to revive, and the scriptures to be read and obeyed, than Universalism again found advocates, and began to spread in Christendom. The Anabaptists of Germany and of England openly embraced it—many eminent men of worth, talents and learning, embraced and defended it—and it formed the hope and solace of hundreds of pious men and women of various denominations. Among many others who embraced and taught Universalism, we have room only to name Winstanley, Earbury, Coppin; Samuel Richardson, author of “Eternal Hell Torments Overthrown;” Jeremy White, Chaplain to Cromwell, and author of “The Restoration of all Things;” Dr. Henry More, Archbishop Tillotson, Dr. Thomas Burnet, Wm. Whiston, Sir Isaac Newton, Dr. George Cheyne, Chevalier Ramsay, John Wm. Petersen, Neil Douglass, James Purves, Dr. Hartley, author of “Observations on Man;” Bishop Newton, Sir George Stonehouse, Rev. R. Barbauld, and his wife, Anna Letitia Barbauld, the authoress; many of the General Baptists, in England; the English Unitarians, almost universally—especially Drs. Priestley, Lindsey, Belsham, and others—and many eminent men in Holland, France, and Germany. In the latter named country, the sentiment has spread most generally, and is now held by a vast majority of both the evangelical and the

rationalist Christians: so much so, that Professor Sears has styled it "the orthodoxy of Germany;" and Mr. Dwight declares that there are few eminent theologians in that country but what believe it. In the United States the sentiment is held, with more or less publicity, among sects whose public profession of faith is at least not favourable to it: as among the Moravians, the German Baptists of several kinds, a portion of the Unitarians, a few Protestant Methodists, and even among the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, according to Professor Stuart's statement. And it will undoubtedly continue to spread silently and unseen, among the more benevolent and affectionate portions of all sects, as rapidly as true scriptural knowledge enlightens their minds; until their prayers for the salvation of the lost shall find an answering support in their hopes and their faith, and the modern, like the primitive Church, shall hold in its purity the doctrine of universal salvation from sin and suffering.

II. THE HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSALIST DENOMINATION, AND ITS PRESENT CONDITION AND PROSPECTS.

As a denomination, Universalists began their organization in England, about 1750, under the preaching of the Rev. John Kelly, who gathered the first church of believers in that sentiment, in the city of London. Mr. Kelly, and his congregations generally, held to a modified form of the doctrine of the Trinity; this has given a character accordingly to Universalism in Great Britain, which it does not possess in the United States. The Unitarians of Great Britain being very generally Universalists, also, in sentiment and preaching, all who embrace Universalism in connexion with the doctrine of the divine unity, join the Unitarians; and hence it is, that the *denomination* does not increase as rapidly in Great Britain as it does in this country, though the *doctrine* is spreading there very extensively, and also on the Continent.

Universalism was introduced into the United States as a distinctive doctrine, by John Murray. Mr. Murray had been converted from Methodism by the preaching of Mr. Kelly, and emigrated to this country in 1770, and soon after commenced preaching his peculiar views in various places in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, and thus became the principal founder of the denomination. For a very interesting biography of Mr. Murray, we refer the reader to his Life; and for a fuller history of the sentiment and denomination generally, and especially of Universalism in America, than my limits will allow me to furnish, I refer

the reader to the "Modern History of Universalism, by Rev. Thomas Whittemore." This, with the "Ancient History of Universalism," before referred to, will give a continuous history of the doctrine, from the days of the apostles down to A. D. 1830.

In the United States, to which we now confine our very brief sketch, Universalism had been occasionally advocated, from pulpit and press, before the arrival of Murray. Dr. George De Benneville, of Germantown, Pa., a learned and pious man, was a believer, and probably published the edition of Siegvolk's "Everlasting Gospel," a Universalist work which appeared there in 1753. The Rev. Richard Clarke, an Episcopalian, openly proclaimed it while Rector of St. Philip's Church, in Charleston, S. C., from 1754 to 1759. Dr. Jonathan Mayhew, Congregationalist, of Boston, preached and published a sermon in its favour in 1762. Besides, the Tunkers (or German Baptists), and Mennonists generally, and some among the Moravians, (including Count Zinzendorf, who visited this country,) held it, though it is believed they did not often publicly preach it. But Mr. Murray was the first to whose preaching the formation of the denomination can be traced. After itinerating several years, he located in Gloucester, Massachusetts, where the first Universalist society in this country was organized in 1779; and the first meeting-house, excepting Potter's, in New Jersey, was erected there by the same, in 1780. Shortly previous to this, other preachers of the doctrine arose in various parts of New England, among whom were Adam Streeter, Caleb Rich, and Thomas Barnes—and organized a few societies as early as 1780. Elhanan Winchester, celebrated as a preacher among the Calvinistic Baptists, and, next to Murray, the most efficient early preacher of Universalism, was converted at Philadelphia, in 1781. The most of these early preachers, thus almost simultaneously raised up of God, probably differed considerably from Mr. Murray, and from each other, on various doctrinal points, while they held fellowship with each other as believers in the common salvation; and thus was probably laid the foundation of that heavenly liberality of feeling among Universalists in this country, which led them to tolerate a diversity of religious opinions in their denomination, almost as great as can be found in all the opposing sects united; and causes them to hold fellowship as Christians, with all who bear that name and sustain that character; and as Universalists, all Christians who believe in universal salvation from sin and death.

From this feeble commencement we date the rise of the Universalist denomination on this continent. Simultaneous with it, persecutions dark and fierce were waged against it by the religious world.

Legal prosecutions were commenced against our members in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, to compel them to support the established sects, and to render illegal the ministerial acts of our preachers, as marriage, &c. For several years they were thus persecuted, insulted, and subjected to vexatious and expensive lawsuits, and denied the Christian name and sympathies, until they were compelled, in self-defence, to assume a denominational name and form, and at last even to publish to the world a written Profession of Faith: not to trammel the minds or bind the consciences of their members, but to comply with a legal requisition, and inform the world what they did believe and practise as a Christian people. The first meeting of delegates (from probably *less than ten societies*) for this purpose, was held in Oxford, Massachusetts, September 14th, 1785. They took the name of "Independent Christian Universalists." Their societies were to be styled, "The Independent Christian Society in —, commonly called *Universalists*." They united in a "Charter of Compact," from which we make the following brief extract, as expressing the views and feelings of the denomination to this day.

"As Christians, we acknowledge no master but Christ Jesus; and as disciples, we profess to follow no guide in spiritual matters, but his word and spirit; as dwellers in this world, we hold ourselves bound to yield obedience to every ordinance of man for God's sake, and we will be obedient subjects to the powers that are ordained of God in all civil cases; but as subjects of that King whose kingdom is not of this world, we cannot acknowledge the right of any human authority to make laws for the regulation of our consciences in spiritual matters. Thus, as a true independent Church of Christ, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, we mutually agree to walk together in Christian fellowship, building up each other in our most holy faith, rejoicing in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and determining by his grace no more to be entangled by any yoke of bondage."

On this broad foundation (Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone) of freedom of opinion and conscience—this liberality and toleration of widely differing views and practices in non-essentials—and this world-wide, heavenly charity to the brotherhood, and to all mankind—the denomination was then based: on that foundation it has thus far been builded up a holy temple to the Lord; and on that foundation of Christian liberty, love, and truth, may it ever continue, until every soul God has created is brought into it as a lively spiritual stone of the universal building.

"The General Convention of the New England States and others," which was recommended by the meeting of delegates above noticed,

held its first session in Boston, in 1786, and met annually thereafter. In 1833 it was changed into the present "United States' Convention," with advisory powers only, and constituted by a delegation of four ministers and six laymen, from each state convention in its fellowship. Rev. Hosea Ballou (yet living in a green old age, and actively engaged in preaching and writing in defence of the Restitution) was converted from the Baptists in 1791. His "Treatise on the Atonement," published in 1805, was probably the first book ever published in this country that advocated the strict unity of God, and other views accordant therewith. That and his other writings, and his constant pulpit labours, probably have changed the theological views of the public, and moulded those of his own denomination into a consistent system to a greater extent than those of any other man of this age, and in this country. In 1803, as before stated, the General Convention, during its session in Winchester, N. H., was compelled to frame and publish the following Profession of Faith. It is the only one that has ever been adopted and published by that body.

"I. We believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a revelation of the character and will of God, and of the duty, interest, and final destination of mankind.

"II. We believe there is one God, whose nature is love; revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of Grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness.

"III. We believe that holiness and true happiness are inseparably connected; and that believers ought to maintain order, and practise good works, for these things are good and profitable unto men."

In the unity of this General Profession of Faith, the entire denomination remained without any disturbance, until in 1827; when an effort commenced to create a division on the grounds of limited punishment after death, and no punishment after death. It finally resulted in a partial division of a few brethren in Massachusetts, who held to punishment after death, from the main body, and the formation by them of "the Massachusetts Association of Restorationists." But the great body of brethren agreeing with these few in sentiment, refusing to separate from the denomination, and the few who did secede being nearly all gradually absorbed into the Christian (or Freewill Baptist) and Unitarian denominations, or coming back to the main body, the Restorationist Association became extinct, and the division has ceased, except in the case of two or three preachers, and probably as many societies, which yet retain their distinctive existence in Massachusetts alone. Besides these, there are one or two societies in the United States, and perhaps as many preachers, who refused to place themselves un-

der the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical bodies of the denomination, yet profess a full and hearty fellowship for our faith and general principles.

Leaving the history of the denomination, we give the following statistics, to show within a small space the progress, past gain, and present condition of the denomination in several of the principal States of the Union, and in the United States and Territories, and British Provinces.

Maine.—First society organized in 1799, first association in 1800, first meeting house erected in 1804, State Convention organized in 1828. It has now 1 State Convention, 1 State Educational Society, 1 State Sunday School Society, 1 State Tract Society, 6 associations, 1 weekly periodical, 117 societies, and 35 churches, 80 meeting-houses, 77 preachers, beside a large number of Sunday schools, Bible classes, and other societies for religious improvement. The net gain for the last 8 years has been, beside in other particulars, 2 associations, 16 societies, 48 meeting-houses, and 48 preachers.

New Hampshire.—First society, 1781; first association, 1824; first meeting-house, about 1808; convention organized, 1832. It has now 1 convention, 1 State Sunday School Society, 1 weekly periodical, 6 associations, 85 societies, 70 meeting-houses, and 38 preachers; beside Sunday schools, churches, &c. Net gain in 8 years, 1 association, 13 societies, 55 meeting-houses, 6 preachers, &c.

Vermont.—First society formed, about 1795; first association, 1804; convention, 1833. It now contains 1 convention, 4 associations, 1 weekly periodical, 97 societies, 68 meeting-houses, 44 preachers, &c. Net gain in 8 years, 17 societies, 38 meeting-houses, 19 preachers, &c.

Massachusetts.—First society, 1779; first association, 1816; first meeting-house, 1780; convention, unknown. It now contains 1 State Convention, 1 State Sunday School Society, 8 periodicals, 5 associations, 141 societies, 58 churches, 108 meeting-houses, 129 preachers, &c. Net gain in 8 years, 51 societies, 59 meeting-houses, 62 preachers, &c.

New York.—First society formed, 1805; first association, 1806; first meeting-house, 1815; convention, 1826. It contains now 1 convention, 1 State Sunday School Society, 3 weekly periodicals, 15 associations, 235 societies, 143 meeting-houses, 147 preachers, &c. Net gain in 8 years, 1 association, 50 societies, 65 meeting-houses, 47 preachers.

Pennsylvania.—First society, 1781; first meeting-house, about 1808; first association, 1829; convention, 1832. Has now 1 con-

vention, 1 publishing society, 2 periodicals, 6 associations, 36 societies, 17 meeting-houses, and 24 preachers. Net gain in 8 years, 3 associations, 16 societies, 8 meeting-houses, and 11 preachers.

In the Southern States, the progress is much slower. In the Western States, the doctrine has been introduced more recently, and its advancement is very rapid. In the United States and Territories, there are now (in 1843) constituting and belonging to the Universalist denomination: 1 United States Convention; 1 United States Historical Society, with a library of 500 rare and valuable books; 14 State Conventions, beside 4 State Sunday Schools, and 3 State Book and Tract Societies; 8 high schools and academies; 24 periodicals, beside annuals; 68 associations (or ecclesiastical councils, formed by delegates from several societies in a county, or several counties); 968 societies, beside about 250 churches; 596 meeting-houses, and 635 preachers. Net gain since last year, 1 State Convention, 6 associations, 50 societies, 19 meeting-houses, and 59 preachers, beside Sunday schools, periodicals, &c. Net gain in the last 8 years, 4 State Conventions, 28 associations, 305 societies, 351 meeting-houses, and 325 preachers.

In the United States and British Provinces in North America, combined, there are 1 General Convention; 14 State Conventions, beside other state societies; 68 associations; 24 periodicals, one of which circulates about 5000 copies weekly; 990 societies, 603 meeting-houses, and 646 preachers. The number of unorganized congregations, and individual believers scattered abroad, is very great also. And from the past increase and rapidly accelerating spread of the doctrine, aided as it is by all the benevolent feelings, holy desires, and humane tendencies of the age, its continued prosperity even unto a final triumph is certain to our minds, even were we not assured of that fact by the promises and prophecies of God recorded in Holy Writ.

III. THE FAITH OF UNIVERSALISTS, AND THE PRINCIPAL SCRIPTURE TEXTS RELIED ON FOR ITS SUPPORT.

As we have before stated, the principles of Christian freedom of opinion and of conscience, and liberal toleration in all non-essentials, adopted by the founders of the denomination, are practised by Universalists at the present day. In religious faith we have but one Father and one Master, and the Bible, *the Bible*, is our only acknowledged creed-book. But to satisfy inquirers who are not accustomed

to the liberal toleration induced by a free exercise of the right of private judgment, it becomes necessary to state in other than scripture language, our peculiar views on theological subjects. The General Profession of Faith adopted in 1803, and given above, truly expresses the faith of all Universalists. In that, the denomination is united.

The first preachers of our doctrine in this country, were converts from various denominations, and brought with them, to the belief of Universalism, many of their previous opinions, besides some which they picked up by the way. Murray held to the Sabellian view of the divine existence, and that man, being wholly punished in the person of the Saviour, by union with him, suffered no other punishment than what is the mere consequence of unbelief. Winchester was a Trinitarian of the "orthodox" stamp, and held to penal sufferings. Both were Calvinistic in their views of human agency, and both believed in suffering after death. Mr. Ballou was Arian in his views of God's mode of subsistence; but gradually abandoned the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, and became convinced that sin and suffering begin and end their existence in the flesh. Others, probably, differed somewhat in these and other particulars from these three brethren. But, very generally, Universalists have come to entertain, what are commonly called, Unitarian views of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, and of Atonement, at least there appears to be a very general similarity between us and the English Unitarians, not only on those subjects, but also on the nature and duration of punishment, on the subject of the devil, and demoniacal agency, and on the final salvation of all moral beings. The Rev. Walter Balfour, a convert from the Congregationalist ministry, in Massachusetts, by his "Inquiries into the meaning of the original words rendered hell, devil, Satan, for ever, everlasting, damnation, &c. &c.," and more especially by his "Letters on the Immortality of the Soul," led some to adopt the opinion that the soul fell asleep at death, and remained dormant until the resurrection, when it was awakened, and raised in the immortal, glorious, and heavenly image. But all, or very nearly all Universalists agree in the opinion, that all sin and suffering terminate at the resurrection of the dead to immortality, when Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed; and sin, the sting of death, be no more; and Hades (hell or the grave) will give up its victory to the Reconciler of all things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, unto God; and God be all that is in all. (See 1 Cor. xv.)

But, as before stated, they keep fellowship as Universalists with all Christians who believe in the final salvation of all intelligences from sin and death, whether, in other respects, they are Trinitarian or Unitarian;

Calvinistic or Arminian; whether they hold to baptism by immersion, sprinkling or pouring of water, or to the baptism of the spirit only; whether they use or reject forms; and whether they believe in punishment after death or not. In short, nearly all the differences of opinion which have rent the rest of Christendom into hundreds of opposing sects, exist in the Universalist denomination, without exciting any division or even strife; yea, they seldom cause even any controversy. Such is the harmonizing influence of the doctrine of one Father, one Saviour, one interest, and one final destiny for the whole human family! Universalists require, as the *great evidence* and *only test* that a professing Christian is what he pretends to be, the manifestation of the spirit of Jesus in his daily walk and conversation—practical proofs that he loves God and man—that he has the spirit of Christ dwelling in his soul, as well as the light of truth in his understanding. “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye have love, one to another,” said Jesus; and the only certain way to know that a man *has* such love, is to see it in his life and actions. No professions, no forms or ceremonies, can ever so well evince this love, as *living it*.

Those who wish to obtain more full and definite information respecting our views, are referred to the following out of the many excellent works published on the subject, viz.: Ballou on Atonement; Ballou on the Parables; Whittemore on the Parables; Whittemore's Guide to Universalism; O. A. Skinner's Universalism Illustrated and Defended; Pro and Con of Universalism; Williamson's Argument for Christianity; Williamson's Exposition and Defence of Universalism; Ely and Thomas's Discussion; D. Skinner's Letters to Aikin and Lansing; Smith's Divine Government; Winchester's Dialogues; Siegvolk's Everlasting Gospel; Petitpierre on Divine Goodness; (these four, and several other good works, are published in the first ten numbers of the “Select Theological Library,” by Gihon, Fairchild & Co., Philadelphia—cost, only \$1 00 for the ten numbers); Streeter's Familiar Conversations; Balfour's Inquiry; Balfour's Second Inquiry; Balfour's Letters to Professor Stuart; Paige's Selections from Eminent Commentators; Sawyer's Review of Hatfield's “Universalism as It Is;” Asher Moore's Universalist Belief; or any of our numerous periodicals, pamphlets, &c.

We close, (for our limits forbid further remarks,) by giving the following scriptural statement of our faith on several important doctrines—a statement which has been widely circulated by our churches and brethren generally, and which may therefore be received with confidence, as stating our sentiments correctly. May we all be instructed

of God into the reception, love and practice of all divine truth, now and for evermore.

I. We believe in one, supreme, and self-existent God, who is love—the Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor of all things—the Father of the spirits of all flesh, and the Judge of the whole earth—whose every attribute and perfection is but a modification of his infinite and unchanging goodness—of his impartial, unbounded and adorable love—and whose unending benevolence and almighty power are unceasingly directed to produce, ultimately, the greatest possible good of his intelligent creation.*

II. We believe in one Lord, the “Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, *to be testified in due time*”—who is the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*—being the promised Seed of the woman, and descended also from Abraham, to whom the promise was made. We believe this Mediator to be the Son of the living God, the Saviour of the world, the brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express image of his person, who has revealed unto us the will of his Father, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. We also believe that God endued this, his Son and Messenger, plenteously with all good gifts; gave him all power necessary to execute his mission, and communicated to him the Spirit without measure, that through him, (as he is the way, the truth, the resurrection, and the life,) the whole human family (for *all* die in Adam, or the earthly nature) might finally be ransomed from the grave, saved (*not in* but) *FROM sin*, delivered from misery, and be raised to *power, incorruption, holiness, glory*, and be crowned with immortal *LIFE* (*not death*) and unspeakable felicity in the resurrection—for as *all* die in Adam, even so, in Christ shall *all* be made alive. We further believe that when Jesus has thus seen of the travail of his soul and is satisfied, he will deliver up the kingdom to God, his Father, and be himself subject unto the Father, that God may be *all in all*.†

III. We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments,

* Wishing to be as brief as possible, we must beg your labour to examine the following, among many other passages of scripture which might be quoted, to prove the foregoing, and further declare our views respecting our heavenly Father. Please to consult them. Deut. vi. 4; Psalm lxxxv. 10, and cxlvii. 5; Isa. xlv. 21, 22; Mal. ii. 10, and iii. 6; Mark xii. 29; John iv. 24; Acts xvii. 24–28; 1 Cor. viii. 4–6; Eph. i. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 4, 5; 1 John iv. 8, 16.

† PROOFS.—Isaiah liii. 11; Matt. i. 21; John i. 45; iii. 34, 35; vi. 37–39, and xvii. 2, 3; Rom. xiv. 7–9; 1 Cor. vii. 6, and xv.; Eph. i. 9, 10; Philip. ii. 10, 11; Colos. i. 14–20; 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6; 2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. i. 2, 3, and ii. 14; 1 John ii. 1, 2, iv. 14, and v. 10, 11.

and receive their doctrines as the rule of our faith, and their precepts as the guide of our practice. We believe them to contain a revelation of the character, will, and attributes of God, our heavenly Parent—of the mission, life, doctrines, and precepts of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour—and of the duty and final destination of man. Believing them to be thus profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the servant of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works, and whoso that properly readeth them become wise unto salvation, we do most devoutly believe that *every promise* and *every threatening* made in them, and relating to a period yet future, will be fully performed and completely fulfilled, to the honour, glory and praise of God, and to the benefit, satisfaction, and final salvation of man. We do not, therefore, believe that the Law (or threatnings) is against the gospel (or promises)—for the promises were first made unto Abraham, and the law was given to Moses four hundred and thirty years afterward, not to *annul*, but to *confirm* the promises. Therefore will all chastisement but tend to produce the blessings promised for all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth, in Christ, the chosen seed.

Disavowing, however, and protesting against all merely human authority in matters of religious belief—from that of the greatest council or highest dignitary, down to the humblest layman—and rejecting the binding force of all man-made creeds and confessions of faith, we acknowledge the Bible as our only creed, and claim for ourselves, what we freely grant to others, the privilege of reading and construing it, under divine aid, according to the teachings of our understandings and the dictates of our consciences.*

IV. We believe that man, in his intellectual or spiritual nature, is the offspring of God—that, even when a sinner, he is authorized and commanded to call God his Father in heaven, and to pray to him for the forgiveness of his sins—that, though a backsliding child, yet he is called on to return to the practice of righteousness, because God is “married unto” him—and that though mankind are, *by creation*, the children of God, yet they may, in a more peculiar manner, become *characteristically* the children of their Father which is in heaven, by imitating his impartial goodness and universal perfections. We believe that man is a moral agent, and as such an accountable being,—that he will *certainly* be punished for *every* crime he commits, and rewarded for *every* virtuous act he performs. We also believe that

* PROOFS.—Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, and xxviii. 14, compared with Acts iii. 25, 26; and Gal. iii. 15–22; Num. xxiii. 19, compared with Isa. lv. 8–13, and Heb. xii. 5–14; 2 Cor. iii. 17; and 1 Cor. vii. 23; Luke xii. 57; John xii. 48, and 1 Thess. v. 21.

man was, by his Maker, "made subject to vanity," gifted with *limited* powers and faculties, and is, therefore, a finite being, capable of performing finite actions only—actions deserving none other than finite rewards and finite punishments. But, as man is the offspring of God, who has given us this life as a free gift, (it being unearned and unpurchased by our exercise of faith, works, or other conditions,) so we contend that the *immortal, incorruptible, or endless* life of holiness and enjoyment, which will be conferred on all mankind in the resurrection, will also be the free, unpurchased gift of our heavenly Parent. Believing thus, we contend that man's real and highest interest is to be virtuous; inasmuch as virtue and happiness, on the one hand, and vice and misery, on the other hand, are as inseparably connected as cause and effect; so that without a firm reliance on God and obedience to his commandments there can be no real happiness—or, in other words, "follow after peace with all men; and holiness, without which no man shall see [i. e. *enjoy*] the Lord."*

V. Respecting the divine laws and precepts given for the obedience of man, we believe they all may be summed up in this: "Love God supremely, your neighbour as yourself"—that "love is the fulfilling of the law"—that "*in* [not merely *by*] keeping the commandments there is great reward"—that all the penalties of God's law are designed to promote its *fulfilment*, and not its *violation*—to secure the reformation and obedience of its transgressors, and not their endless misery and disobedience—and that being framed by unbounded wisdom, with a perfect foresight of all its operations, and armed with almighty power, not one jot or tittle shall ever depart from it until it receives the endless, voluntary and happy obedience of every intelligent being in the universe.†

* PROOFS.—Gen. ii. 7, Num. xvi. 22, Mal. ii. 10, and Heb. xii. 9, compared with Luke xi. 2, 4; Jerem. iii. 14, and James iii. 9; Matt. v. 43–48; Exodus xxxiv. 6, 7; Prov. xi. 21, xvi. 5, and Rom. ii. 5–13, Titus iii. 3–8, and Rom. viii. 19–24; Rom. xi. 6, compared with 29–36; Isa. lvii. 20, 21, and Gal. v. 22; 1 Cor. xv.


† PROOFS.—Rom. xiii. 10; James i. 25; Ps. lxxxix. 31–34; Isa. i. 5, 6; Prov. iii. 11, 12; Ps. cvii. Ps. cxix. 67, 71, and Heb. xii. 11; Rom. viii. 7–13; Matt. v. 17, 18.



BW4065 .R94

He pasa ekklesia; an original history of

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00051 9530



